

LIBER
ACCUSATIONIS
IN PAULUM SEXTUM

TO OUR HOLY FATHER POPE PAUL VI
BY THE GRACE OF GOD AND THE LAW OF THE CHURCH
SOVEREIGN JUDGE OF ALL CHRIST'S FAITHFUL
WE PRESENT A COMPLAINT
AGAINST OUR BROTHER IN THE FAITH, POPE PAUL VI
ON ACCOUNT OF HERESY, SCHISM, AND SCANDAL

by

THE ABBÉ GEORGES DE NANTES

Submitted to the Holy See 10 April 1973
by the Rev. Abbé de Nantes and Sixty delegates of the League of the Catholic Counter Reformation

TO OUR HOLY FATHER POPE PAUL VI
BY THE GRACE OF GOD AND THE LAW OF THE CHURCH
SOVEREIGN JUDGE OF ALL CHRIST'S FAITHFUL
WE PRESENT A COMPLAINT
AGAINST OUR BROTHER IN THE FAITH, POPE PAUL VI,
ON ACCOUNT OF HERESY, SCHISM, AND SCANDAL.

Who am I, Your Holiness, to dare ask you to pass judgement upon yourself? I am nothing, and you are everything. Even the insignificant position that I had ten years ago - that of country parish priest - is mine no longer for, suspended by the Bishop of Troyes since the 25th August 1966, I have been deprived of the right to celebrate Mass or 'to preach, in the diocese in which I live - while you occupy the highest place of honour on this earth and, in the Church, a position of such responsibility that no greater can be imagined and one, moreover, which enables you to receive help and guidance from the Holy Spirit in a way open to no other human being.

How, then, dare I rise up against you?

Do I perhaps seek reassurance in the example of those who, by virtue of their sanctity, and without consideration of rank or position, are able to exalt the humble and put down the mighty, fill the poor with riches and take away the possessions of the proud? Not even that, for not only am I a simple priest, lowest in the scale of the hierarchy, but also a sinner among the rest. In the course of history there have been great Saints who have risen up against Popes guilty of untruth, but I do not claim either personal merit or any mystical enlightenment to justify the reproach I bring against you. No, I tremble rather when I recall the words written about you by Cardinal Journet, describing you as "a living saint to whom we must raise our eyes with love" while myself he looks upon as lost beyond hope, unless, by the Grace of God, my eyes should be opened, before the end...(*)

There are, moreover, numerous supposed "revelations" current today which, claiming to come direct from Our Lord or His Blessed Mother, describe you as their child of predilection, the most beloved and worthy of Popes, who is undergoing a veritable martyrdom at the hands of the evil men around you, as well as through all those agents of disorder and instigators of heresy who are ravaging the Church in spite of you. If all this were indeed true, what comfort it would give us to think that, in spite of the appearances, we were suffering with Your Holiness rather than as a direct result of your acts!

If, in spite of all this, I am yet bold enough to rise up against you, before the entire Church, it is because I draw the right to do so in that very Faith, Hope and Charity which the Holy Spirit bestows upon all the Faithful provided they do not themselves place obstacles in the way through heresy, schism or apostasy. For 25 years I have been a priest, and given to the study of theology. But I claim no basis for my action other than the simple, elementary Faith of our Baptism which is common to all who belong to the Catholic and Roman Church. For, as you must be aware, my total and open opposition to the present Reformation of the Church, which I reiterated at the conclusion of my Process at the Holy Office, against the formally expressed wish of Your Holiness, did not result in the imposition upon me of any canonical penalty. I was declared to have "disqualified" myself by my own extreme statements, but this does not in any way affect my continued membership of the Church. I remain one of the children of him who is the Father of all - one of Your Holiness's subjects. And a child has the right to complain to his father - even about the evil ideas and hateful acts of this very father himself.

As an insignificant member of the Believing Church, I have no authority to judge anybody nor to declare any proceeding null and void. Nor can I claim to provide, myself, the authentic interpretation of even the least article of Faith. But I do have both the right and the duty to remember and call to mind that teaching which I received as the doctrine of the Teaching Church - a doctrine that is constant and universal, irreformable and infallible. For this teaching is binding upon all the faithful, and upon Your Holiness as much as upon the simplest of us, on pain of spiritual death.

(*) Quoted from a private letter to a religious, dated 21st January 1973.

Over the past ten years it has become overwhelmingly evident to me who, by virtue of my faith, "worship as a rational creature" (Rom.12:1) that what we are taught today is totally opposed to what we were taught in the past. The Catholic Credo that was engraved upon my soul as upon a tablet of virgin wax has always remained there, clearly defined, and nothing that was superadded to it ever caused any blurring of the characters. The Church spoke always in the same language. But these past ten years, she has been speaking, through your own mouth, and that of the Council and the Bishops, in an entirely new language which, though it has not the authoritative ring of the past, and is itself neither constant nor consistent, is the language of novelty and change, tinged with heresy, schism and apostasy. Against this I felt constrained to protest inwardly and for the sake of honesty, openly and publicly also, submitting my protest to examination by Authority, until today it is being taken to the very highest Tribunal of all, at which you, the Sovereign Pontiff, preside as Judge and as the one ultimately responsible for the interpretation and safeguarding of Divine Truth - while you bear at the same time the responsibility for this abominable Reformation. If I, the most unworthy of Christ's faithful, am so keenly conscious of the contradiction between the Catholic religion and the reformed religion of today, then surely this realisation ought in yourself, as the most eminent member of the faithful, attain an infallible clarity and prophetic certainty. Tell us therefore, we beseech you, where the Truth is, and where the heresy, the schism and the scandal: proclaim it solemnly and we will believe your word.

I say "we" because I am speaking, not only for myself, but as one of the many faithful who are today suffering under this conflict. When I present myself at the feet of the Holy See, I go accompanied by ten religious and fifty lay people who are themselves the express delegates of some 3000 Catholics making up this "Roman Legion" whose thoughts and feelings are united to ours and the list of whose names is being handed to you on this 10th April 1973 together with the present Libellum. These people love you, Most Holy Father, and place in you their last hope against the invasion of Satan into the Church. But, trembling, they also join with us in accusing you of being the one responsible, through complicity or collaboration. Amidst prayers and tears they beseech you either to justify yourself or to recant, or else to lay down the charge of your Sovereign Pontificate in favour of someone else. They can no longer endure this terrible suspicion culminating in their inward certainty of your guilt. The disorder spreading from the very Head of the Church into her members has become unendurable for them.

These several thousand Catholics are not in any way a sect apart, or a body separated from the rest of the faithful. They are linked to the rest of the Church by numerous ties and, to varying degrees and despite some differences in interpretation, their complaints reflect those of certain members of the Hierarchy, even among those in the highest positions and close to the Throne of Your Holiness.

That is why I, who am nobody, feel in conscience bound to ask Your Holiness, in the name of the Church and of the Catholic people whom you have misled into believing that the present Reformation was necessary for the Church, by abusing your own authority over them, that you should bring yourself to justice on a charge of heresy, schism and scandal, publicly persevered in. In bringing this charge I am but making myself the miserable but truthful echo of the indefectible Church herself. And you alone, Most Holy Father, are able to clear yourself of this charge if you can do it, speaking with the authoritative and infallible voice of the Faith of this same Church: if, speaking in this manner, you can show that you are right and we are wrong. To us this would seem impossible - for it would mean that the sum total of this Reformation could be assimilated into the Body of Divine Truths which express the Deposit of our revealed Faith.... No, this cannot possibly be.

Never has there been a conflict comparable to the present. The Church cannot continue in such a state of contradiction. It is your duty, Most Holy Father, to take note of our accusation, and to study and pass judgement upon this affair. The peace of the Church and her fidelity to Christ are at stake. I should wish - we should all prefer - to be proved wrong so that your August Person could be right. But the honour of God, the welfare of the Church and the salvation of souls speak louder than our human sentiments, and they tell us that it is you who are wrong. We pray for your spiritual conversion and for your change of heart, in order that the Church may be delivered from the yoke of Satan which holds her enchained and restored to Christ so that she may bring forth once more her fruits of life and holiness.

INTRODUCTION:

YOUR HISTORIC DECISION OF 1964-65

For the past ten years the Church has been in a state of "immanent apostasy", or, to use your own expression, she is undergoing "autodemolition" at an accelerating rate. It is a state entirely without precedent, and one involving every aspect of the Church and spread through all her members. "By their fruits you shall know them" said Our Lord, and what we see today are the evil fruits of that tree planted at the very centre of Catholicism - the Conciliar Reformation. He who planted it in the field entrusted to him is dead. May God forgive him! You stepped into his place and preserved the tree, giving it every protection and encouragement until now it has spread to cover everything with its shadow. That was your wish, and you have achieved it. If the Church is indeed destroyed through the new Reformation, then she will be dying at your hands.

For in the introduction of the Conciliar Reformation, of all that led up to it and followed from it, you yourself played a vital role.

THE GREAT BATTLE WAGED BY THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS.

When, in 1963, Your Holiness ascended to the Throne of Peter, the Church was, as it were, poised in an unstable equilibrium between two opposing religions: the long-established Faith with all the authority of the centuries behind it, confronted with another, hitherto suppressed as illicit but now rapidly gathering momentum to assert its new-found freedom.

I need not remind Your Holiness that it is the traditional Catholic Faith alone that has any claim to sovereignty in the Church. Surely everyone knows that. But I will recall the constant battle waged to defend this same Faith, by all your Predecessors, who were fighting against precisely this new, "reformed" religion which began in 1963 to supersede the other. We should have to go back at least, and principally, as far as Luther. But this same spirit of "reform" took on an extraordinary force in the 18th century, and we can pinpoint as a herald of our present troubles the Synod of Pistoia, of sinister memory, which was condemned in a truly prophetic spirit by Pius VI in his Bull Auctorem fidei (28th August 1794).

The society which arose out of the turmoil of the Revolution - our own modern society in fact - drew its inspiration from Emmanuel Kant and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, opposing its naturalism and subjectivism to the certainty of the Faith and the recognition of the need for Grace. When this revolt of man against God found a prophet within the Church herself, in the person of Lamennais, the Popes embarked upon the battle which ensured that, from the days of Gregory XVI's Encyclical Mirari Vos, of 15th August 1832, even unto the time of Vatican II, these new ideas were forced to remain outside the Church. Over a period of a hundred and thirty years...

They had to fight, but they held their own. We find already in the Syllabus of 8th December 1864, a formidable list of modern errors; Pius IX, though momentarily and accidentally influenced by the new ideas, more than made amends by his ceaseless and powerful struggle against them, and particularly against the one most likely to make for itself a breach in the Church's defences - that of "Catholic liberalism" (16.6.1871)

The First Vatican Council marked the highlight of this Pontificate, asserting both the triumph of the Divine Faith and also the Infallible Authority of the Church in the person of her Head on earth. This twofold exaltation was certainly providential, for it gave guidance on how to remedy the evils that were yet to come. In addition, the Council gave the seal of its authority to the doctrinal correctness of the pronouncements made by the Pontiffs in the course of the preceding century against the errors of the day.

Leo XIII did not definitively break with this tradition, though he did sometimes seek the good of the Church in the adoption of certain compromises, such as his call upon French Catholics to rally to the Republic (1892) and his acceptance of the word "Democracy", in a modified sense, in 1903. He continued the fight of his Predecessors against the "delirium" and "licence" of liberalism, this "freedom to follow perdition", which would set up man as a rival to God, in his Encyclicals Immortale Dei and Liber-tas Praestantissimum.

Pius X, at the dawn of our own century, brought all his saintly gifts to bear upon the fight. His implacable analysis of doctrinal Modernism and his condemnation of it in the Encyclical Pascendi of 1907, as well as his censure of the politico-religious Utopia of Marc Sangnier, in his Letter on the Sillon, remain as two brilliant beacons shining in the darkness of our century.

Pius XI did not repudiate any points in this teaching intended to counteract the great modern heresies, even though he might in certain cases have given the impression that he saw some good in them. His admirable Encyclical on Christ the King, Quas Primas, of 11th December 1925, which opposes the prevalent secularisation, deserves a special place in our hearts. Apart from that I should like to mention only one other Encyclical - Mortalium animos, of 6th January 1928, which seems to be a condemnation in advance of all that has since crept into the Church under the pretext of Ecumenism.

To this great mass of documents emanating from the Apostolic Authority there came to be added, for the greater benefit of the Church and her expansion and influence, the invaluable pontifical teachings of Pope Pius XII. Every one of these forms a bulwark against the subversion then spreading within the Church with the help of the enemies of God and law and order. They represent already the beginning of the Counter-Reformation! There is, for instance, Mystici Corporis (29th June 1943) directed against the reformist concepts of the nature of the Church, Divino Afflante Spiritu (30th September), on Modernist trends in biblical studies, Mediator Dei (20th November 1947) and the admirable Haurietis Aquas (16th May 1956) on the Sacred Heart. Last but not least, we must mention Humani Generis (15th August 1950), directed against reformism in matters of dogma, which characterises the new Modernism.

Let me add to these, in order to pay honour to the memory of Pope John XXIII, whose personal loyalty to Tradition was unfailing, the firm and remarkable Encyclical Veterum Sapientia of 1962, in which, with the dignified strength of one who is defending his birthright, he struck a blow against the daring inroads of the reformers.

A study of the history of the Papacy over these hundred and thirty years shows plainly that 1963 did not witness the birth of a new philosophy, as a result of spontaneous generation or even of a sudden illumination from Heaven. There was only one new development at that time - that these ideas, which had existed for a long time but in the past had never been allowed to enter the Church which, in accordance with the teaching of her Pontiffs and the rulings of the First Vatican Council, had definitively condemned them, now began to be not merely tolerated by her, but looked upon as more respectable day by day.

THE NEW THINKING INVADES THE CHURCH.

To this invasion we can put a precise date and a particular title: it is represented by the Opening Discourse to the Council of 11th October 1962, delivered by John XXIII but prepared and edited by yourself, at the time Archbishop of Milan. That was the day when the doors of St Peter's were opened to the New Thinking. Its first achievement, on the 20th October, was the approval, by a Council as yet unalerted, of the Message to the World. We have heard it said that, together with the French Bishops, Cardinal Montini was among the most influential promoters of this document. In any case, you were later to eulogise it in lavish terms: "An unexpected but admirable gesture: one might see in it the sudden eruption of the Church's prophetic charisma." (*)

The Encyclical Pacem in terris followed soon afterwards, provoking a flood of praise for Pope John and the modern spirit of his thinking, which was inspired by the Declaration of the Rights of Man and a belief in man's liberty and universal peace remarkably in accord with the masonic inspiration of modern society. Is it true that the Pope repented later that he had signed, without having carefully studied, the document prepared by Mgr Pavan, whom you have made Rector of the Lateran? Be that as it may, the event was of crucial importance in this invasion of the Council by the "new thinking".

We must include mention of the secretly prepared text of Karl Rahner which was put before the Council Fathers as a summary of the New Theology which it was hoped they would adopt in toto, in order to give a complete summary of the inroads already made by Modernism and Progressism on the eve of your elevation to the Sovereign Pontificate.

1963: THE CHURCH IS IN A STATE OF SUSPENSE.

On the death of John XXIII, in June 1963, there were two alternative courses possible: either to suspend this Council which had already ventured into paths which had been formally and consistently condemned by the Holy See in the past, and thus to end, authoritatively, this exercise in subversion before it had gone too far, overwhelming, as its effects appeared even then; or else to continue the work credited to John XXIII, to the applause of the innovators within and without the Church and of all who had at heart her destruction. The choice depended on who was elected by the Conclave.

You were elected on the promise to continue the Council. On 7th June, speaking in

(*) From a Discourse given on 29th September 1963

Milan Cathedral, you had said of John XXIII: "We should not merely be mindful of the paths he pointed out for us, but we would do well to follow them." It would seem, however, that a number of those who gave you their vote did so believing that, though you intended to continue the Council, you would change its course. But the rest must have known that you intended to carry the Reformation to its conclusion - with or without the Council, or even against its wishes... There is no doubt that you bore, already, considerable responsibility for what was to follow.

For a period of some fourteen months we had the impression that the Pope refused to take sides between the two extremes and thus maintained a balance between them. In fact this period proved of great value to the Reformers who acquired respectability in the public eye by the mere fact of appearing to be threatened. Your Discourses at the Opening and Closing of the Second Session, though imbued with the new thinking, still expressed this balance between the extremes and I too was among those who failed to see where your sympathies lay. A comment you made about the Roman Curia will serve as an example: "It would be wrong to look upon this active and loyal body... as useless and outdated, corrupt and concerned only with its own interests... but, having said this, we would not deny that it is in need of improvement." (*) In thus appearing to defend it, you are in fact giving support to the accusations levelled at it by the very fact of mentioning them in this context, and thus helping to drive nails into its coffin.

At the voting on 30th October 1963, each side believed itself supported by the Pope, and that was how the "October Revolution" (**) was effected. When I returned to Rome in the Spring of 1964 I heard much talk of the mystery that surrounded your government of the Church and, having heard you preach very beautifully about the Blessed Virgin Mary upon whom you wished to bestow the title of Mother of the Church, I left with feelings of devotion towards you and indeed wrote about this in the Letters to my Friends.

1964: YOU COMMIT YOURSELF TO THE REFORMATION.

It was your Encyclical Ecclesiam Suam (6th August 1964) which finally showed me which way the wind was blowing. Your discourse of 29th September 1963 had already pointed the way, but I had not fully understood at the time. But now, in this the Blueprint of your Pontificate, you declare your aims, even while maintaining all the time that balance between the extremes which continued to confuse most people: Vital experience... but also Faith- Renewal... but also Tradition, and the striving for spiritual perfection - Dialogue... but also the preaching of the Faith. I was horrified to realise that, despite these reservations, you were opting for that New Religion which every one of your Predecessors had resisted with all his might as coming from the Demon. What I wrote then - and I believe I was the only one to say this - I would not wish to change in any way today.

From then on, in spite of the appearances which sometimes did not bear this out, and in spite of your applying the brakes occasionally to reduce the acceleration of the Conciliar Reformation, your efforts were directed to consolidate it, with its Ecumenical Dialogue, Openness to the World, Reforms and Changes of all sorts. For a moment, at the end of the Third Session, you did indeed seem to betray the party of the innovators who, not understanding, turned against you in resentment. But you were merely helping the Reformation to proceed without raising alarm or open opposition. After that, you made no secret of your wish for unlimited changes. It was through your support that the most extreme and dangerous schemata were promulgated despite opposition. At the UN, you pronounced a most un-Catholic discourse and, on 7th December 1965, promulgating the Declaration on Religious Liberty and the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today, you gave vent to a glorification of Man-who-makes-himself-god which is without parallel in the annals of the Church. (***)

Not a soul raised a protest in the whole great Conciliar Assembly and yet that moment saw the abandonment of the Ancient Faith in favour of this Cult of Man which you had just solemnly proclaimed. There was no more turning back. A Church which had accepted these two discourses would accept anything: subversion had won its victory. The Reformation had free reins to change and overthrow everything. One man bears the responsibility for this, and that is yourself.

(*) Discourse given on 18th November 1965

(**) This was the occasion on which the new interpretation of the Collegiality of Bishops was accepted by the Council. (Translator's note)

(***) Discourse given on 7th December 1965 to the Council

THE CHURCH IS LED INTO SCHISM

Our opposition dates from the month of August 1964, and it has continued to mount unceasingly since then. You are aware of the sequence of events, for it led to my Process at the Holy Office, which I underwent at my own request and which in truth was not really my Process at all, but that of the Council and yourself. Because, in order that your orthodoxy and orthopraxis, your ideas on both the doctrinal and the pastoral level, should be vindicated, I should have had either to recant or be definitively condemned. But the Process did not result in either of these alternatives. I have continued, for the past five years, to accuse you of heresy, of schism, of scandal. The evidence continues to mount and more and more Catholics have come to agree with us when we insist that one religion has been substituted for another, and that this has been accomplished through a Revolution directed from above - through a change of head under the same mitre. It is the Holy See which has undergone a change of religion, without saying much about it, but saying just enough to make the entire Church follow the new path, attracted to it by the novelty or cajoled into it by obedience.

The time has come to take the final step, and put all this to the test of divine power. And so I bring before your own Jurisdiction a process against yourself, accusing you of heresy, schism and scandal, and challenging you - if this New Religion does indeed come from Christ - to proclaim this solemnly in His Name, for it is one which all the Popes before you had branded as the offspring of Lucifer.

THE CAPITAL CHARGE

Admittedly, there have been many edifying discourses during these ten years of your Pontificate and a number of cases in which your decisions served to further the glory of God and the welfare of souls. If we say little about these that is not because we are unaware of them. It was these words and acts which influenced us to view in the best, the most Catholic, light much that at first sight appeared suspect.

Nevertheless, a careful study leaves us in no doubt that it is change and novelty rather than Tradition which is given pride of place and that both your words and your acts witness to a spirit that is incompatible with the truly Catholic spirit of the Church. This is evident primarily in the general pattern that underlies your doings, and appears on the practical, empirical, rather than on the theoretical or doctrinal level. It is this general guide line which I make bold enough to refer to as "heteropraxis". But even assuming that in your own mind this pattern has remained nothing more than a practical guide line and has never been translated into terms of doctrine, it has nevertheless provoked a change in doctrinal thinking in the Church. And as you too have referred to it in terms of a change in thinking on matters connected with the Faith, we are obliged to characterise it as indeed a "heterodoxy". For a Pontiff cannot go on acting in a manner different from his thinking without coming eventually to think in the way he acts.

I - HETEROPRAXIS: RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Even while the Council was still heatedly arguing about the matter, you were already referring to Religious Liberty as though it formed part of common teaching, as though there were no particular difficulty about it. It might perhaps be conceivable that a doctrine to this effect should be solemnly defined by the Pope, and proclaimed with his infallible authority - but in that case you would have had to show that it was already contained in the deposit of Revelation and that it had formed part of the Tradition of the Church. Now such a demonstration is manifestly impossible, inconceivable. And so you make indirect allusions to it, in passing, when you address audiences who are incompetent or indifferent on the matter, or who are accomplices. That the principle of Religious Liberty has been thus illicitly imposed upon the Church is your doing.

You refer to it, on the occasion of your Opening Discourse of the Second Session of the Council, as one of the "fundamental human rights" and again, on 8th December 1965, at the Closing of the Council, as to one of the "legitimate and sacred rights due to every honest human being." But the turning point was your visit to the UN, on 4th October 1965, when, anticipating any decision by the Council, you proclaimed it in the presence of that Masonically inspired Assembly, using the term in the sense in which your audience would interpret it: "It is your task here to proclaim the basic rights and duties of man, his dignity and liberty, and above all his religious liberty. We are conscious that you are the interpreters of all that is paramount in human wisdom. We would almost say: of its sacred character. For your concern is first and foremost with the life of man, and man's life is sacred: no one may dare to interfere with it."

The "wisdom" of that Assembly - your Predecessors would have called it rather a delirium - asserts that man is free and that this freedom is sacred. That nothing on this earth is greater, that no God on High can impose His Rule upon man's liberty, nor any man exercise authority over another, to teach or govern, to judge or even to punish him in the name of God. And this is what you acknowledge as the first and foremost among the "Rights of Man", speaking both in your own name and also - as though entrusted with its blank cheque - in the name of the Council.

This new liberalism had already appeared, though somewhat disguisedly, in your radio message for Christmas 1964 and in your Allocution of 26th June 1965. The one thing the faithful would gather from it is contained in this sentence: "This important doctrine can be summed up in these two propositions: that in matters of faith no one must be hindered, and no one must be forced. Nemo impediatur, Nemo cogatur." All constraint is to be banished from this domain where, according to you, it is love alone which commands. Any public authority which would claim to intervene "thereby arrogates to itself the right to penetrate into a domain which lies outside its competence". But you would allow the requirements of public order to impose restrictions upon this individual liberty; in doing so you are submitting religion to the control of the State police! And this conviction which you have professed yourself and imposed in advance upon the Coun-

cil when the latter was still seriously divided upon the matter, is one which your Predecessors had always condemned. It is because we are faithful to their Magisterium that we have from the first refused to accept it.

THE ECLIPSE OF THE CHURCH'S MAGISTERIUM.

As part of the application of this newfound liberalism you abdicated the exercise of your Supreme Magisterium. You tell us that man is free in matters of religion and so you think it better not to make use of authority to tell him God's Truth. Already on the 29th September 1963 you deflected the Council from any idea of promulgating "dogmatic definitions", or "solemn formulations". The reason why you wished to give up the exercise of this authority is made clear in your words: "We do not wish to turn our Faith into a cause of polemics against our separated brethren." (*)

Similarly, your Encyclical Ecclesiam Suam does not lay claim to any binding authority: "Nor do We propose to make this encyclical a solemn proclamation of Catholic doctrine or of moral or social principles." What then is its purpose? "Our purpose is merely to send you a sincere message, as between brothers and members of a common family." (**) But this essentially liberal or permissive attitude takes away from the binding character of even the most solemn of your teachings on matters of dogma or morals. What is the point of a Credo if it is not to be looked upon as infallible? Or of an Encyclical Humanae Vitae if there is no obligation or penalty attached to it? And today, when our theologians are coming out in favour of abortion, you do, admittedly, speak out against it very firmly, but in the context of a discourse addressed to jurists instead of definitively condemning these child murderers and excommunicating the theologians who make themselves into their accomplices. You are so afraid of encroaching upon man's sacred freedom to think and do as he likes that you are not willing for any human being to speak to him with the Authority of God!

The same permissive spirit led you to abolish the Anti-Modernist Oath ordered by St Pius X and remaining in force from 1910 until our own day, and the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent, introduced by Pius IV and in force ever since. Your new formula is worded so that it cannot embarrass anybody and no one in fact takes it the least bit seriously. Its only function was to cover up the abolition of the others. Under Paul VI, you are free to think just as you please, at whatever level of the Hierarchy!

On the other hand, believing yourself illumined by the Holy Spirit, you haven't been afraid to ascribe to your sayings and to those of the Council a certain form of extra-canonical infallibility, or supposed divine inspiration. This has no lawful basis, and you do not indeed pretend to found it on your proper authority, but rather on a force of love that binds not through obligation but because its power is irresistible! Later, you put it into words: that you saw the reconciliation between obedience and individual liberty, not in divine Authority and Infallible Truth of doctrine, but in love. (***) This is the result of your Immanentism.

NO MORE PROHIBITIONS OR EXCOMMUNICATIONS.

Having proclaimed Religious Liberty to be a sacred and inalienable right of man, you are no longer able - indeed you do not wish to do so - to exercise any legislative, judicial or coercive power even inside the Church. You would rather be loved than obeyed, and to charm rather than command.

You do not see anything which requires to be suppressed; you are not concerned about "removing any specific heresies concerning the Church, or... remedying any public disorders - for disorders of this sort have not, thank God, raised their head in our midst." (****) But they exist, surely, within secular society? Admittedly. "The Church ... might content itself with conducting an inquiry into the evils current in secular society, condemning them publicly, and fighting a crusade against them... But it seems to Us that the sort of relationship for the Church to establish with the world should be more in the nature of a dialogue, though theoretically other methods are not excluded." (*****)

(*) Discourses to the Council. (In French, Centurion Edn., P.117)

(**) Ecclesiam Suam, No. 7

(***) Address given on 16th October 1968.

(****) Ecclesiam Suam, No. 44.

(*****) Ecc. Suam, No 78.

On 17th February 1969 you admitted that grave errors and serious disorders were indeed widespread in the Church. But even then, you preferred to let things take their course: "It would be easy, and even perhaps our duty to rectify...but..." But... you would let "the good people of God do it themselves"; and why? "You will have noticed, my dear friends," you were to say, "to what extent the style of Our government of the Church seeks to be pastoral, fraternal, humble in spirit and form. It is on this account that, with the help of God, We hope to be loved. (*)

On 9th July of that year you announced a further stage in the liberalisation of ecclesiastical discipline: "We are about to see a period of greater freedom in the life of the Church and, therefore, in that of each of her children. This freedom will mean fewer formal obligations, and fewer inward inhibitions. Formal discipline will be reduced, all tyranny will be abolished... Every form of intolerance and absolutism will similarly be abolished." And so, at a time of gravest crisis of Faith and Morals, you inaugurate the anarchy of a "permissive society" where all are free to follow the desires and promptings of their private conscience!

It was for the same reason that you decided, very early on, to reform the Curia, the Holy Office in particular. (**) On 15th June 1966 the Index was abolished. Soon the Holy Office changed its name and its function; it would no longer condemn but devote itself to constructive research! The time of interdicts and excommunications had passed. That was why I had all the difficulty in the world in obtaining my request to be "judged" by Rome, because "that was no longer done", as Cardinal Lefebvre explained to me.

DIALOGUE: "THE CHURCH ENGAGES IN CONVERSATION"

The new form of religious contact, both between those within the Church and between the Church and those outside, is that of dialogue. In your eyes, it was soon to become the only lawful means of such contact. You announce it in *Ecclesiam Suam* as the great novelty of your Pontificate and indeed as the form of the Church's apostolate in this new stage of her history. What is the great thing about it? That dialogue excludes every appearance of authority, superiority, or obligation or, as you prefer disparagingly to say, of fanaticism, intolerance, or tyranny. It represents a human and brotherly, free and equal, exchange of opinions: "It is a way of making spiritual contact... avoids peremptory language, makes no demands." (***)

You claim that this was also the way of Our Lord: "No physical pressure was brought on anyone to accept the dialogue of salvation; far from it. It was an appeal of love. True, it imposed a serious obligation on those towards whom it was directed (cf. Mark, 10, 21), but it left them free to respond to it or to reject it.... Hence, although the truth we have to proclaim is certain and the salvation necessary, we dare not entertain any thoughts of external coercion. Instead we will use the legitimate means of human friendliness, interior persuasion, and ordinary conversation. We will offer the gift of salvation while respecting the personal and civic rights of the individual." (***)

Here I object that you have misrepresented the Gospel, ascribing a false meaning to Mark 10, 21. Moreover, such an interpretation would amount to a condemnation of the teaching and practice of the Church throughout the ages. Finally, I maintain that it is a contradiction in terms to "proclaim certain truth" and "necessary salvation" in the manner of "ordinary conversation". "It would indeed be a disgrace if our dialogue were marked by arrogance, the use of barbed words or offensive bitterness... It is unencumbered by prejudice. It does not hold fast to forms of expression which have lost their meaning and can no longer stir men's minds." (***) Such terms would put in the wrong all who, burning with zeal for the salvation of souls, would testify to Jesus Christ like the Apostles and the Saints of God.

Clearly, the concept is a totally new one in the Church: "All we ask for is the liberty to profess and propose to those who, in all liberty, wish to receive it, this religion, this new link forged between men and God by Jesus Christ Our Lord" is what you said in Bethlehem. You would extend your liberalism even to God Himself. No longer is there the one Revealed Religion, necessary for salvation, but merely one among many possible, for those who wish to choose it.

(*) Address to the Roman Clergy.

(**) 18th November 1965 (Discourse to the Council).

(***) *Ecclesiam Suam*, Nos 81, 75, 85.

GOD'S RELIGION ECLIPSED BY MAN'S FREEDOM.

If the Church is to "engage in conversation" (*), will this not involve her renouncing, at least for the moment, her divine authority? Is it not inevitable that, whether as part of her strategy or as a stratagem, she will obscure to some extent the absolute character of Revelation and of our Redemption? Coming closer and establishing communication is, you would say, but the first step towards converting those outside... But is there no danger that your new method of free dialogue, instead of being a preparation for preaching and polemics, for announcing the need to believe under pain of damnation, will become a mere substitute for these, and that we shall be left with a mere exchange of views on a purely human level? The discussion of individual tastes and points of view takes the place of the divine work of Grace and Truth! Moreover, in your desire to please and flatter you concede to everyone a part of the truth, leaving them to think that we too must correspondingly be in error to some extent. When you admit to all intents and purposes that all religious opinions have rights and respectability, a certain value even, and that they must form the object, not of condemnation, but of good-natured discussions, then your human goodwill takes precedence over divine truth - at least on a purely practical level.

Such a policy on the practical level inevitably leads to the acceptance of its theoretical counterpart. Before this your Encyclical, the Faith was something absolute, and unbelief was a disaster. Upon these hinged the eternal salvation of souls and also the temporal wellbeing of mankind. He who believes in everlasting Hell and, even more, in the Beatitude of Heaven, he who believes in Jesus Crucified, and that without Him we can do nothing, does not treat these mysteries as objects for mere casual talk. He will teach the sacred doctrine with authority, engage in polemics with heresy and rather use the force of laws to help men know the truth and keep the Faith, to be converted and lead virtuous lives, than to let them go to their damnation, and the world to its ruin, for the sake of "liberalism".

You on the other hand are led by your exaltation of human freedom and by your constant search for that which flatters men in their error and even in their revolt, to exaggerate the importance of subjective dispositions at the expense of the Rights of God. If you allow the Christian Faith to become - at least to all intents and purposes - one opinion among many - then it will cease to rule over the world of men. Its objective quality will be clouded over. The distinction between Heaven and Hell, between the Grace of God and His Malediction, between piety and impiety, will pale into insignificance. You may well defend yourself in advance against criticism when you say: "An immoderate desire to make peace and sink differences at all costs (irenism and syncretism) is ultimately nothing more than scepticism about the power and content of the word of God which we desire to preach", (*), but your dialogue is bound to lead to irenism, syncretism, and eventually to scepticism, precisely because it gives a relative quality to the Absolute Truth of God.

The result is to increase man's pride, for by your dialogue you have invited him to make himself judge of things divine. From the moment that you proclaimed dialogue as the only lawful tool of the apostolate the world of Christianity began to shake in its foundations: for instead of God being the acknowledged Judge of man, it is now man who is called upon to judge God. And so your heteropraxis leads on to the heterodoxy of the Cult of Man.

II - HETERODOXY: THE CULT OF MAN

In the Discourses you gave to the Fourth Session of the Council, we see how your sympathy for man, and your desire to understand and meet him halfway, to respect, admire and love him, which were all "apostolic" and "pastoral" to begin with, have developed into a veritable cult of man himself.

THE LOVE OF MAN

On 14th September 1965 you expressed the Church's love for man in very strange terms: "And what was the Church doing at that particular moment? the historian will be asking; and the reply will be: The Church was filled with love...The Council puts before the Church, before us in particular, a panoramic vision of the world: how can the Church, how can we ourselves, do other than behold this world and love it? (Cf. Mark 10, 21) It will be one of the chief acts of the Session which is now beginning to take such a look at the world: once again, and above all else, love; love for the

(*) Ecclesiam Suam, No 111, 88.

men of today, whoever and wherever they may be, love for all...The Council is a solemn act of love for mankind. May Christ come to our aid, in order that it may indeed be so."

What is new about this love? That it adores its object. It is a love which has no regard for the Truth of God, or His Law, or His Grace, but looks upon man, and upon the world, as worthy of admiration, service, and devotion, in their own right. As you quote, once again Mark 10, 21, I must protest at this repeated misapplication. Jesus did indeed love the rich young man, because the latter was one of the rare human beings who could claim that he had always observed the law of God. Does this apply to the world today? And because He loves him, Jesus proposes to him the greater perfection of the Evangelical Counsels. This pains the man, and he turns away, for he remains attached to the goods of this world. There is nothing here to justify the adulation which you make into a characteristic of the Conciliar Church.

This is the idolatrous love which led to Religious Liberty being proclaimed as a fundamental and absolute right of man. I say absolute, because the limitations which might be imposed upon it by the police seem to me not worthy of mention. The same love led to the promulgation of the notorious Pastoral Constitution on The Church in the World of Today which you referred to as "the crowing achievement of the Council", entirely inspired by the cult of Man, "the apex of nature".

FAITH AND CONFIDENCE IN MAN.

Such a love knows no constraint because it is no longer dependent on and controlled by the love of God, and soon turns into idealisation and idolatry of its object. This applies in your case as in any other, and leads you, in your blind and unbridled passion, to preach a faith and confidence in man which are little short of the absurd. Thus, on 2nd December 1970, to the journalists in Sydney:

"For we have faith in Man. We believe in the good which lies deep within each heart, we know that underlying man's wonderful efforts are the motives of justice, truth, renewal, progress and brotherhood - even where they are accompanied by dissension or, sometimes even, unfortunately, by violence. It is your task, not to flatter him but to help him become conscious of his true value and his true potential. It is up to you to plant in man the seeds of this ideal by virtue of which he is able to attain the true stature of a creature made in the image of God, who desires him to aim higher and higher, to build together a city of brotherhood for which all yearn and to which all have the right... The Catholic Church, in particular since the impulse given her by the Conciliar Aggiornamento, goes out to meet this same man whom it is your ambition to serve!"

Is it not written: "CURSED BE THE MAN THAT TRUSTETH IN MAN AND MAKETH FLESH HIS ARM AND WHOSE HEART DEPARTETH FROM THE LORD!" (Jer. 17,5)? And again, "FOR WITHOUT ME YOU CAN DO NOTHING." (John, 15, 5)? But you would encourage him to aim higher and higher, to outstrip himself...perhaps even to seek to be the equal of God?

THE CULT OF MAN WHO MAKES HIMSELF GOD.

Yes, Most Holy Father, it was you who, on that historic day of 7th December 1965, addressing the entire assembled Council, gave a Discourse unlike any other in the annals of the Church, unlike any other that is ever to come, a Discourse which enthroned within the Church of Christ, the CULT OF MAN: "The Conciliar Church has also, it is true, been much concerned with man, with man as he really is today, with living man, with man totally taken up with himself, with man who not only makes himself the centre of his own interests, but who dares to claim that he is the end and aim of all existence.... Secular, profane, humanism has finally revealed itself in its terrible shape and has, in a certain sense, challenged the Council. The religion of God made man has come up against the religion (for there is such a one) of man who makes himself God. And what happened? An impact, a battle, an anathema? That might have taken place, but it did not. It was the old story of the Samaritan that formed the model for the Council's spirituality. It was filled only with an endless sympathy. Its attention was taken up with the discovery of human needs - which become greater as the son of the earth (sic) makes himself greater..Do you at least recognise this its merit, you modern humanists who have no place for the transcendence of the things supreme, and come to know our new humanism: we also, we more than anyone else, have the cult of man."

This shows how your heteropraxis is slipping into a heterodoxy which I must refer to not so much as heresy as apostasy. And all through your apostolic generosity! Against all the wise counsels and infallible teaching of your Predecessors, you play the Good Samaritan, nodding goodnaturedly to every man, his brother...And in your unfettered love you make friends with the Goliath of the Modern World, kneeling before the Enemy of God who only feels hatred and defiance for you. Instead of fighting, like David, ag-

ainst the Adversary, you express yourself full of love for him, you flatter him, and end up in his exclusive service! Your charity towards the Enemy of God turns into adoration and service, to the extent even of rivalling him in his error and blasphemy.

For you have allied yourself with Man-who-makes-himself-god! You vie with the pride-intoxicated atheistic humanists of our day in the cult of man. Just read again this Hymn to the glory of Man which you intoned on the occasion of one of the voyages to the moon and which is a blasphemous parody of the Hymn to Christ the King of Ages(*):

"Honour to Man;
Honour to his thought; honour to his scientific knowledge;
Honour to his technical skill; honour to his work;
Honour to human endurance;
Honour to that combination of scientific activity and organisation by which man, unlike the other animals, can invest his spirit and his manual dexterity with instruments of conquest;
HONOUR TO MAN, KING OF THE EARTH AND TODAY, PRINCE OF THE HEAVENS;
Honour to our living being, in which is reflected the image of God and which, in its triumph over matter, obeys the biblical command: increase and rule."

It was on a similar occasion that you said: "Man is both giant and divine, in his origin and his destiny. Honour therefore to man, honour to his dignity, to his spirit, to his life."(**)

GOD WHO WAS MADE MAN GIVES WAY BEFORE MAN WHO MAKES HIMSELF GOD.

You do, admittedly, make references to God and even, in passing, to Christ the Son of God made Man, in that fantastic discourse of 7th December 1965. But you do not have anything to say about the Cross of Christ, or the gift of the Holy Spirit, about Baptismal Grace, indeed about the whole treasure of the Mysteries of the Faith which are the Truth, the Life, and the Virtue of the One Catholic Church.

The aim is always man..."the first goal in that ascent towards the supreme and transcendent goal, towards the cause and origin of all love". The countenance of man reveals to you the countenance of Christ, as you tell us, quoting Mat. 25, 40 out of context, and hence, the countenance of the Heavenly Father - and so you behold God in man. And you say triumphantly: "Our humanism becomes Christian and our Christian faith becomes theocentric, so that we could equally well say that, in order to know God, we must know man." But, saving your respect, Most Holy Father, this is surely idolatry! And I would ask you whether you have not yielded to that third kind of temptation, that of making a bargain with Satan, which Jesus resisted in those words that are a condemnation of yours: "Begone Satan! For it is written: the Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve." Jesus refused, even for the sake of seeing all the kingdoms of the earth accepting His rule, to pay to anyone else that homage which belongs to God alone. Whereas you, in order to win the world, for the sake, no doubt, of making it more disposed towards that conversion of which it stands in need, you dare to proclaim, in the name of the whole Church and of the greatest Council of all time, your sympathy for man in his efforts to make himself god, and to declare your own homage of Man.

Compare this Discourse with that of St Pius X in his first Encyclical which served also as the blueprint of his Pontificate:

"He who considers these things is entitled to fear that such a perversion of minds might represent the beginning of those evils foretold for the end of time, forming as it were, their stepping stone on to the earth, and that the Son of Perdition of whom the Apostle speaks might already be coming amongst us. For religion is being attacked with the greatest boldness and vigour, the dogmas of the Faith are being battered, and no effort is spared to tear asunder man's link with the divine. Moreover - and this is what the same Apostle tells us is typical of Antichrist - man in his unspeakable temerity is usurping the place of the Creator, and placing himself above all that bears the name of God. Powerless to extinguish within himself entirely the concept of God, he yet shakes off the yoke of His majesty and dedicates to himself a temple in the form of the visible world, where he receives the homage of his own kind..."

That is why all our efforts must be directed towards bringing mankind back under the rule of Christ. To achieve the result of Our hopes, it is vital to spare no efforts in

(*) Angelus, 7th February 1971

(**) 13th July 1969

uprooting entirely this monstrous iniquity peculiar to the times we live in, which leads man to set himself up in place of God."(*)

The teaching and sentiments expressed here are totally different - are they not? - in their spirit and inspiration. St Pius X, for whom you have little affection and whom you avoid quoting even when such quotation would be imperative upon you, preaches Christ in accordance with the fullness of the Catholic Faith and Law. He resists the temptation by Satan and bravely takes up the battle against him...And you, Most Holy Father? Your liberalism has moved from the pastoral sphere into the doctrinal, and from the practical level to the theoretical. Was this done deliberately? It was already evidence of greatest temerity to override the condemnations of your Predecessors in order to adopt this liberal policy, even for the best of apostolic intentions. But taken in its entire context, it seems rather that, having first yielded to the second of the three temptations - that of tempting God through foolhardiness - you have let yourself fall into the third, which consists in abandoning God in order to serve Satan, so that you finish up by adoring man who puts himself into the place of God - and this is a mark of Antichrist.

You announced this new Credo on 7th December 1965, in the presence of the bishops of the whole world. How far these were inattentive, or your accomplices, or fascinated by you, I do not know. But Holy Mother Church cannot, can never subscribe to such a philosophy. That day marked the point of no return along the road that leads away from the Church of Christ in order to proceed towards that other Church which is truly yours - the Antichurch or Synagogue of Satan, where man makes himself God. But in the meantime, through men's indifference or cowardice, you are still on the Throne of Peter, in the capacity of Supreme Judge of the Church. The capital charge we bring against you concerns your liberalism and your cult of man, which we maintain are blasphemous, heretical, schismatic and finally apostatic. The decision is for you to make, for you are still the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth. Pass judgement upon yourself and, if I have lied, cut me off from the Church. But you know that I am not lying. If I have told the truth, then cut yourself off from this Sacred Body which you have betrayed!

(*) E Supremi Apostolatus, 4th October 1903.

HERESY

What made it possible for heresy to erupt within the Church on the scale on which it has, over the past ten years? Beyond any doubt, the call first made on 11th October 1962, and oft repeated by yourself since then, for a new language, for new formulations which would make the Catholic Faith accessible to modern man and increase its credibility for him (*). Under the umbrella of this vast doctrinal "aggiornamento" all the heresies in the world were able to shoot up into the light of day without any risk of suppression, for had not total liberty and immunity been promised to "Christians engaged in research"? Scholars and theologians had imprudently been allowed completely free rein (**). Just as though you actually wished to provoke a drama, you chose the moment when improvisation and creative inventiveness were already widespread, when it had become fashionable to change everything, for the abrogation of those instruments and institutions whose task was to safeguard doctrine. Authority was yielding, rule and order were being abolished. The result could only be a free-for-all.

Surely, if you felt strongly about the orthodoxy of the Faith, you would not have let it go so cheap! Indeed, so many of your doings can only be explained on the assumption that you have a certain fear of orthodoxy, in a number of respects, and a hearty dislike for the Ordinary Magisterium and for the teaching of your Predecessors. It is because you are yourself guilty of heresy that you are so keen to free the Church from the yoke of the Catholic Faith. It is because you yourself merit condemnation that you are neither able nor willing to condemn anyone.

Moreover, you persist in tolerating, even protecting and supporting, often in opposition to the loyal services of your Roman Curia, all the heresy mongers at large today, even where you do not share their errors; for the various heresies have a sort of mutual sympathy for each other, and their common opposition to the Faith links them together more strongly than their individual differences separate them. Thus you feel an indirect solidarity towards all the heresy mongers and, realising that you have their support, you make yourself their accomplice and give them the protection of your Sovereignty.

I - YOUR PERSONAL HERESY: THE "M.A.S.D.U."

This philosophy, which constitutes your personal heresy, I first wrote about in February 1965, and repeatedly since then. I have described it as a "Movement for the Spiritual Animation of World Democracy" (***), "M.A.S.D.U." for short. It represents a politico-religious Utopia which you adopted, so it is said, under the influence of your family background but also, no doubt, of those philosophers whom you had admired and studied for a half-century. On being raised to the Sovereign Pontificate you could of course have repudiated them, but you preferred rather to impose them as far as possible upon the entire Church, in a way moreover that suggested that it was done in the name of your Ordinary Magisterium. It was easy enough to make these ideas spread, for the world as a whole was already widely imbued with them and it had been only the Church and her Sovereign Pontiffs who had offered them resistance. They are the same as the revolutionary Messianism of Lamennais, and the Christian Democracy of Sangnier, worked into a system by your friend Jacques Maritain to form an "Integral Humanism".

This system can be broken down into three parts, to which there is to be added one important corollary:

- 1) It is not simply the Church and Christendom which form the "unit of Salvation", but mankind as a whole.
- 2) The new Gospel of this community is the Declaration of the Rights of Man, with its trilogy of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.
- 3) The building of a World Democracy is the analogy here on earth of the Kingdom of God, and it is to be attained through the coming of Justice and Peace, in Truth and Love.

(*) The concept of "new formulations" appears even in the Credo and Mysterium Fidei!

(**) Discourse given at the University of St Thomas, Manila.

(***) In French "Movement d'Animation Spirituelle de la Democratie Universelle"

And the Corollary: that the function of Religion - by which is to be understood a union of all the existing religions - is to provide inspiration and Spiritual Animation for mankind thus regenerated.

1) "MANKIND" TAKES THE PLACE OF THE CHURCH.

Your philosophy, Most Holy Father, takes no account of the distinction, or rather that irreconcilable opposition, the existence of which was affirmed authoritatively by your Predecessors, for instance by Leo XIII in Humanum Genus: "The human race is split into two hostile camps, both of which are engaged in a constant battle, the one for truth and virtue, and the other for all that which is opposed to these. The one is the true Church of Jesus Christ...and the other is the Kingdom of Satan."(*) You make it clear in Ecclesiam Suam that you will have nothing to do with what Rev. Congar refers to as the "Catholic ghetto", nor of course with the idea of the Church having authority over secular society - the origin of what we know as "Christendom". You acknowledge only an autonomous purely secular society, or "the world", existing on a merely human level, independent of the Church and apart from it, and neither Christian nor Satanic. When you quote St Paul to the Corinthians in that Encyclical you deliberately leave out these two passages: "And what concord hath Christ with Belial...And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?"(II Cor 6, 15-16) As you can hardly preach - in so many words - a truce with the forces of evil, so you pretend that they do not exist. (**) For you the matter seems already to be settled one way or the other - either Satan has already agreed to a truce or he is no longer a force to be reckoned with - or else he is non-existent!

All men are brothers.

As far as you are concerned, all divisions, wars and rivalries are mere misunderstandings, misfortunes, "still remaining" among "men of goodwill" but which are on the way out. The world is gradually moving towards unity, men are discovering their common origin, aspirations and destiny. Good and evil is found in all, in similar proportions, but all are equally anxious for a total regeneration of humanity: "Man must go out to meet man, and the nations come close to each other as brothers and sisters, as the children of God. In such mutual friendship and understanding, in this sacred communion (sic), we must all join together in working for the common future of humanity... Such union cannot be built upon terror or upon the fear of mutual destruction, it must be based on a common love which embraces the whole world and has its roots in God who is love", is what you said in Bombay on 2nd December 1964.

This is the first article of your new humanistic Credo: All men are brothers because they have God for their Father: "Man devotes himself to his fellow-man, because he recognises him as his brother, as the son of one and the same Father." (***) And again: "This then is Our message for the year 1971. It echoes, this new voice born of the civilised conscience (?), the Declaration of the Rights of Man: 'All men are born free and equal in rights and dignity; they are endowed with reason and conscience and should conduct themselves towards each other as brothers'. The philosophy of our civilisation has at last reached this summit. Let us not turn back. Let us not lose the treasure we have gained by this victory of reason. Let us strive rather to apply, with logic and courage, this formula which forms a landmark of human progress: 'Every man is my brother'. This is essentially what we mean by peace. And it is something that applies to all." (****)

This is a transposition into humanistic terms of the wonders of Grace, the Mysteries of Filial Adoption and the Communion of Saints. You have despoiled the Church of the gifts bestowed on her by Christ in order to adorn with them the whole "civilised" mankind of today.

All men are essentially good.

Moreover, all men are good, and all share the desire for peace, justice and progress. As an "expert in humanity" (*****) you are prepared to stand bail for them; and

(*) Encyclical dated 20th April 1884

(**) Ecclesiam Suam, 62. The cited passages are omitted from the quotation of the relevant verses of II Cor.

(***) Discourse to World Food and Agriculture Organisation, 16th November 1970.

(****) Message for World Day of Peace, 14th November 1970

(*****) Discourse to the UN, 4th October 1965.

assure us that nothing is impossible, for they are all essentially good at heart: "Yes indeed, peace is possible, because men are essentially good and look towards reason, order, and the common well-being; it is possible because it already exists within the heart of men of the new type, of the young, and of all who understand the forward march of civilisation..." (*) "At the present time fraternity asserts itself; friendship is the basis of every modern human society... Democracy, which is so widely acclaimed by human societies today, must take on a wider, universal form, in order that the barriers that still stand in the way of an effective human brotherhood shall be broken down." (**) It is one of the axioms of your thinking that man is good, that all peoples are desirous of peace and that the democratic form of modern society allows them to impose this desire for peace upon their rulers who stand in its way. And so you sometimes indulge in wishful thinking: "You, the people, you have the right to make yourselves heard... You have a lawful and sacred right to insist that your leaders arrange things so that you do not have to suffer... We live under a system of democracy... That means that it is the people who command, that power is vested in numbers, in the people as a whole. If we are conscious of the social progress which this represents all over the world then we must allow democracy to have its say: the people do not want war. The masses must insist that there shall not be any more wars in the world." (***)

And so you take it for granted that all men possess those virtues which exist in Christian society in a supernatural manner thanks to the merits of Christ, acquired through the Sacraments and obedience to God's commandments; and you see this Universal Democracy as automatically bringing the progress of mankind in its wake. You speak as if there were no Demon reigning in the world, nor such a thing as Original Sin, or indeed actual sin and disorder to any significant extent! You see nothing but goodness in the hearts and natures of all who are alive today.

Your one and only hope, the United Nations.

And so you place your hope, not in God's own One and Holy Church, but in the United Nations, which you proclaim to be mankind's supreme hope, the model, in the temporal sphere, of what the Church is in the spiritual! Whereas your Predecessors had denounced as evil any such parody of that Unity which is founded upon Christ and sustained by the Holy Spirit, for you it constitutes a mystery and miracle in its own right. You are prepared to place your trust and hope in that Masonic Tower of Babel rather than in the Church. Did you not say at Manhattan, on 4th October 1965:

"The peoples turn to the United Nations as their last hope for peace and concord: We make bold to bring here with Our own their tribute of honour and hope... You exist and work to unite nations, to bring States into association. Let Us put it in the form that you exist to get people together with one another. You are... a bridge between peoples... We are tempted to say that your characteristic is to reflect in the temporal order what our Catholic Church is in the spiritual order - the sole organization of its kind, and universal. Nothing higher on the natural plane can be imagined in the ideological edifice of humanity...

There is being established here a system of solidarity which receives the regular and unanimous support, for its supreme civilizing objectives, of the whole family of peoples for the good of each and all. This is the finest aspect of the United Nations Organization, this is what gives it its most genuinely human guise; this is the ideal that mankind has dreamed of in its journey through history. We would venture to call it the world's greatest hope, for it is the reflection of God's design - a design transcendent and full of love - for the progress of human society on earth, a reflection in which We can see the gospel message, something from heaven come down to earth."

In your dreams, the UN - that noisy Tower of Babel, ineffective in any good cause, all too effective in evil ones - replaces the Church, indeed it takes a more important place. It becomes the realisation of God's design, the fulfilment upon earth of the prophecies. But what contempt for the Church is implied in your reference to this organisation as the last chance of mankind! And also what contempt for Christ when He has been left entirely out of account in the construction of this vast edifice and all its subsidiaries - UNESCO, WFAO, and so on, all militantly anti-Christian. You are being led into error by your "cult of man". You despoil God of His works and perversely adorn

(*) Message for the first World Day of Peace, 1st January 1968.

(**) Christmas Message 1964.

(***) Discourse of 1st January 1970.

with them the ludicrous, venomous creations of Satan!

"There is no need for Us to point out," wrote St Pius X in his Letter on the Sillon, "that the advent of World Democracy can have no relevance to the work of the Church in the world...the reform of civilisation is essentially a religious task, for true civilisation presupposes a moral foundation for it, and there can be no morally based civilisation without the true religion: this is a truth which can be demonstrated from the evidence of history."

To pretend that mankind is good and generous, fraternal and peace-loving, if it has no recourse to Christ, is a heresy. It is a blasphemy to say that the UN is the analogy, in the political sphere, of the Church, to refer to it as the earthly reflection of the authentic, universal, design of God. Not only is it a lie and an insult to Christ, but also an absurdity. If one can speak about a temporal extension of the Gospel, then this must refer to a civilisation based on Christianity, as is found in the Catholic nations, where Christ is the centre and the social order is indeed an extension of the Church, a work of Grace and Faith - and not to that hotbed of Masonry, the United Nations.

2) THE CHARTER OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN TAKES THE PLACE OF THE GOSPEL.

For two thousand years, the Church, and the whole of Christendom, have drawn their strength from the Grace of God and the theological virtues, of which the moral virtues are but derivatives. Our Gospel teaches that without the love of God there can be no true love of our fellow-men, and without the Grace bestowed by Christ only through His Church, there can be no love of God. But where is this "new humanity", for which you foresee such a glorious future, supposed to draw its strength? According to Maritain, whose perverse reasoning you seem to follow entirely in this matter, the earthly city, the "universal democracy", of his "integral humanism" is to be founded upon "conscience", and take for its Law the Declaration of the Rights of Man. And so, like Maritain, you compromise your Faith for the benefit of your "new humanism", and look upon the Rights of Man as being simply a translation into profane language of...the Message of the Gospel! You become oblivious to the distinction between man's natural moral conscience and that moral strength which comes only through divine Grace, and between human solidarity and Christian charity... So, once again, Christ and the Church are pushed into the background in favour of secularism and agnosticism. Can it really be the Pope who speaks thus?

Man's conscience as the source of life and moral perfection.

"The structure you are raising cannot rest on purely material and worldly foundations; that would be to build a house on sand: it must be based on conscience...Never so much as today, in a period when human progress has been so rapid, has it been necessary to appeal to the moral conscience of mankind." (*)

This "civic conscience of the world" (**) you elevate into a source of light and strength which are capable of guiding mankind and helping it to rise above its self-interest, passions and unruliness. This theory of yours, which regards conscience as a sovereign moral force in its own right, on to which "the religious sentiment" is as it were grafted, is made plain, in a perfectly alarming manner, in one of your Wednesday allocutions:

"In giving expression to his moral conscience, man frees himself from the temptations that assail him as a result of that hereditary blemish which affects his complex organism: original sin. As a result he finds again, at least the idea and desire of perfection. It is this moral conscience which allows him to rise above those temptations that are degrading for his dignity, which helps to rid him of fears that make him cowardly and stupid, and which endows him with those sentiments that make a man honest and strong.

It was from this conscience that the great characters of the human drama drew their strength: the innocent, the heroes, the saints. Think of Antigone. Think of those numerous figures that command our admiration, in past history or the annals of the present day, on account of their firm and unshakable moral conscience, and especially in those cases where religious sentiment gave this a vigour that can come from nothing else. Let us think of Thomas More (sic, Tr.'s note) Saint Augustine, the two Saints Theresa, and in general terms of those saints who have given us a history of their

(*) Discourse to the UN, 4th October 1965

(**) 2nd August 1972

lives, such as Edith Stein, or of examples that we find in literature, such as a well-known passage in Aldechi, by Manzoni." (I had not heard that Edith Stein had been canonised! And as regards Manzoni, most certainly not a saint!)

The rest of the text bears out the impression we have gained from this passage, of a philosophy that is naturalistic and subjectivistic, in which religion serves merely to add to that force of conscience which already exists without it, a certain supplement of "feeling", of the power of the "heart". How does this tie up with the teaching that without the Grace of Christ our Redeemer we can do nothing? What place has it for the Sacraments, and prayer?

The Rights of Man - the New Gospel.

This "moral conscience of mankind" (*) finds its expression in the Rights of Man:- "You make your stand here for the fundamental rights and duties of man, his dignity, his freedom and in the first place his religious liberty." "It is easy enough to resolve to set out along a road towards a new history which is one of peace, one that is truly and fully human..." (*)

This universal "conscience" gives rise to a whole new humanistic decalogue, whose commandments, "personalistic" if you like, are merely human and social, whose only God is Man. It is the moral system corresponding to the "cult of man" which you have embraced. Truth, justice, dignity, solidarity, equality, fraternity, etc. are all high sounding words which intoxicate the listener. But do you really believe that they are capable, present though you believe them to be in the conscience of all men, of overcoming the World, the Flesh and the Devil? No, Most Holy Father, if you forgive my saying so, mere words such as these have never yet given rise to the least act of virtue, the smallest act of self-abnegation or sacrifice, the least gleam of forgiveness of a wrong...

Listen to what St Pius X had to say; he might have been speaking about you: "According to him, man would not be truly man and worthy of that name, until the day when he had acquired a conscience that was enlightened, strong and independent, which would allow him to dispense with any other master and to obey none but itself, even while carrying the gravest responsibilities. Such are the phrases used to exalt human pride."(**)

A Pagan Morality.

You are deeply committed to this naturalistic philosophy; it appears that you believe in it! Thus in Bombay, on 2nd December 1964, when you speak about mankind's expectations: "Mankind is undergoing profound changes and searching for guiding principles and new forces which will show it the way in the world of the future." And what do you offer it? Christ? The Law of the Gospel? The Grace of the Sacraments? Not a bit of it, only this, which is surely a descent from the sublime to the ridiculous: "We must come closer to one another, not merely through press and radio, by boat or by jet aircraft, but with our hearts, by mutual understanding, esteem and love." You remain on the human level, leaving religion out of your flights of fancy. The love of man from which you expect so much is based on the cult of man himself. You are a Mason, if a Christian one. But it is the Mason that speaks in you, and never the Christian.

You gave yourself away once, on 1st September 1963: "We are living in the era which succeeded the French Revolution, an era that reflects all its disasters and its chaotic and confused ideas, but also its thrill and confidence... We became aware of something new: of living ideas (!), of parallels between the great principles of the Revolution, which had, after all, only adopted certain Christian ideas - fraternity, equality, progress, the desire to raise up the humble classes. To this extent, it was something Christian, but it had taken on also an anti-Christian, secular, antireligious nature, which tended to pervert that share of the heritage of the Gospels which was calculated to increase man's nobility and dignity." That day, the Church was seized by trembling and amazement. You must have realised it and said no more. But those phrases had given an insight into the way your mind works, had shown us that it is the principles of 1789 which form your gospel.

3) THE BUILDING OF WORLD DEMOCRACY REPLACES THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Do I have to tell you that the practice of the moral virtues is made possible for Christians by the action of Grace and in the light of the theological virtues, because they desire to "be dead with Christ" in order that they "shall live also together with

(*) Address of Pope Paul to the UN

(**) St Pius X, Letter on the Sillon.

Christ" (Rom.6,8)? Or that there can be no improvement of the temporal order except - so all your Predecessors taught - in so far as Christians are prepared to "seek first the Kingdom of God and His Justice", that is to say, that life of grace and holiness which will help them to attain the beatitude of Heaven?

But once again you take over these shining attributes of the Kingdom of Heaven - its Peace, Rest, Sweetness, Joy, Glory, and perfect Happiness for all - and invest with them your own day dream of an earthly paradise, in the shape of a Brave New World to be built by men's own efforts.

"And you shall change the face of the earth".

"There is something great and new being brought into existence which could change the face of the earth." (*) Without wishing to be too sarcastic, I can see here that personal Messianism which seems to lead you to believe that, when you pass by, a miraculous and definitive Salvation is set in motion by the call of your fervent humanism. When you visited the UN, you seemed to think that your Discourse would form the opening of a new era of peace. But the Good Tidings that you bring is one from which Christ has been left out, and which you promise for the immediate future, here below, as the result of efforts made by men on their own initiative under the distant but approving eye of some powerless, Unknown God.

Listen to yourself speaking as a prophet: "Citizens of the World, when you wake at the dawn of this New Year 1970, reflect for an instant: whither leads the path of mankind? We can cast a bird's eye glance over it today, a prophetic glance. Mankind is on the march, moving towards a greater mastery of the universe... What purpose is served by this conquest? It enables men to live better, more intensively. Mankind, subject to the limitations of time, seeks its fullness of life, and finds it... It is moving towards unity, towards justice, towards a state of balance and perfection which we call Peace... Peace is the logical aim of the world today: it is the end towards which tends all progress; it is the final order towards which the great efforts of civilisation are directed... We proclaim Peace to be the chief fruit of man's selfconsciousness, of that capacity by virtue of which he desires to see the direction of his journey, both now and in the future. Peace, we proclaim once more, is in various different ways the end and aim of normal and progressive development of society." And so on. (**)

Like the other false prophets, you mislead men and you betray your God. And if you really believe even a part of what you say then your credulity must be very great. But it is your incredulity that is really terrifying, for all these your statements are contradicted by the Word of God Himself: the builders of the Tower of Babel cannot expect their labours to lead to peace or rest. It is Christ alone who gives us Peace, and He gives it not as the world gives it.

Once again, you would do well to listen to St Pius X, in his Letter on the Sillon: "No, my Venerable Brethren, we must be insistent in recalling, at a time of social and intellectual anarchy such as the present, when each man sets up as his own teacher and lawgiver, that we must not try to build the city except as God has built it, that society cannot be soundly built upon foundations other than those the Church has laid for it, and not unless it is she who directs the labour. It is no use saying we must create a new civilisation, or build the new city in the clouds; it has been built, it is already in existence, in the shape of Christian civilisation, of Christendom. It is this which must be constantly installed and restored upon these its foundations which are both natural and divine, against the repeated onslaughts of an unhealthy Utopianism based on revolt and impiety: omnia instaurare in Christo."

FROM PEACE TO JUSTICE.

At first, you speak of Peace as though it were the fruit ripened by civilisation and by the United Nations. Your concern was restricted to the settling of various local conflicts which you regarded as sequels of the last World War. You were concerned to replace armed force with negotiation so that, with the establishment of peace and with the cooperation of all peoples, the world should reach a state of prosperity and happiness unknown before. Such an ideal was still very conservative.

But before long, a new idea began to be mixed up with that of peace: that of justice. "Persuaded that peace can be built only upon justice, we must all make ourselves the advocates of justice. For the world has great need of justice and Christ wishes us

(*) 19th July 1971

(**) Message for World Day of Peace.

to hunger and thirst after justice." (*) But when Christ blesses those who hunger and thirst after justice it is of a different sort of justice that He speaks - of one directed towards God, of holiness: social justice is but a secondary result of this. So here too, you have misrepresented the Gospel in order to make it into the message of your own new-style, revolutionary messianism.

Promoting Justice.

Once it has engaged in this track of justice, your thinking changes quickly from a conservative approach to a revolutionary one. Instead of remaining concerned with the aim of peace and the unheard of prosperity which it is to bring, you make its coming conditional on the prior attainment of justice. This is the dialectic that inspires your Encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (26th March 1967). Your interpretation (a Marxist one!) of the international situation shows a threatening prospect: either the well-to-do peoples will share their wealth with the disinherited or else the latter will resort to war. That, for you, is Justice - which you equate with Equality - with war as the only alternative!

From that time on you have persistently encouraged the greed of the peoples of the Third World by putting before them the concept of "development" as the prime and essential end of all their efforts, to be attained by exerting pressure upon the richer nations to share their wealth with them - or rather, to give back what they had stolen. When you adopted the catchword of "Development, the new name for peace", on the occasion of the Day of Peace you adopted a crypto-Communist programme. For it implies that the condition of the underprivileged peoples is inhuman, intolerable, and is bound to resolve itself through war unless the well-to-do peoples provide a quick solution.

Non-violent Revolution.

You have followed the dialectics of class warfare in encouraging the poor to revolt against the rich, the underdeveloped peoples against the countries of the West - in Bogota especially but also in Manila and in Australia. But you have done it in a manner calculated to mislead the former category and reassure the latter, by recommending the solution proposed in the Gospel (but it was your Gospel you really had in mind) - that of Love, and rejecting the concept of violence. You said, for instance, on 21st August 1968, at the very moment of your departure for Bogota:

In times past and in circumstances totally different from our own the Church herself and even the Popes may have had recourse to the force of arms and to their temporal power. However good the reasons may have been, and however excellent their intentions - we have no wish today to pass any judgement on these - the times are past when it was right to resort to the sword and to force, even in the interests of justice and progress. We are confident that all good Catholics and all sound modern opinion shares these Our feelings. We are convinced - and this is what We shall say on the far side of the world - that the time has come for Christian love between all men. It is this love which must become operative, which must change the face of the earth - which must bring into the world justice, progress, fraternity, and peace."

But because such a Utopia ruled by love is totally unattainable in a world which has no regard for God, what you preach is turned into an a priori justification of violence, on the understanding that, provided nothing can be attained by "love", by non-violence, hatred and revolution can take over and be assured of your blessing.

You have taken the critical step by maintaining that the state of the masses and of entire peoples is inhuman and unendurable. No one needs to be told twice that they fall into those categories for whom you regard "revolutionary uprising" as justified - "where there is manifest, long-standing tyranny which would do great damage to fundamental personal rights and dangerous harm to the common good of the country".(**) Because it is a foregone conclusion that your solution through "love" will not work, the Marxist assessment which you make of the situation amounts in practice to giving the green light to the alternative, which is that of violence.

WHILE THE IDEAL FADES INTO THE DISTANCE, WAR RISES ABOVE THE HORIZON...

Peace seems now to be for you, like the concept of Beatitude in Christian spirituality, or that of classless society in Marxist philosophy, an ideal that, as regards the here and now, must necessarily be unattainable. It is war which is close at hand - for the Christian soul, this is the fight against self, the struggle to exercise charity,

(*) Papal Discourse to the Council.

(**) *Populorum Progressio*, No 31.

and finally that of a holy death through which it can attain Heaven and meet Christ face to face. For the Marxist, it means Revolution. And for you, Most Holy Father, it is the "struggle for man" which in your Discourses sounds like the heroism of Christian virtue but which, when translated into deeds, comes to resemble much more closely the struggle of revolutionary terrorism.

For what is your "programme"? To "reduce inequalities, fight discriminations, free man from various types of servitude and enable him to be the instrument of his own material betterment, of his moral progress and of his spiritual growth". (*) It is an aim befitting a worldwide philanthropism - something to be attained through "love". In fact you often refer to it by the term that should be reserved for the mystery of our Redemption, as "salvation". But translated into practical terms, it becomes a policy of wholesale socialism which can be realised only through force, so that you have made yourself the most effective propagandist for Communist revolution in the whole world.

St Pius X would say of you, as he said of the Sillon: "He beckons encouragingly to Socialism, while his eye is fixed on a chimera." (**) And this is what you understand by "God's design"? When it is in fact the very opposite, the most successful attempt ever made to turn people away from Heaven and make them into the slaves of the Lord of the Earth. (***) Your Encyclical Populorum Progressio, leaving out of account your idyllic call for love, could be the Mein Kampf of the Antichrist. And the more so because the place which is allotted to religion in the construction of this world that is purely human, is to be shared out between "the Churches" without distinction.

THE COROLLARY: RELIGION AS THE SPIRITUAL ANIMATOR OF THE IDEAL WORLDLY CITY.

But we have every reason to ask, Most Holy Father, whether such a system can have any place at all for religion? For it is a dictum of humanism that Man is self-sufficient: the Tower of Babel is the very opposite of a cathedral, it is a place buzzing with human energy, human solidarity, human fraternity. The very concept rules out any express appeal to God or acknowledgement of His Transcendence, any recognition of Revelation, or supernatural Redemption, of the Church as a specific entity, of her dogma or worship. If these are tolerated at all it is only as forms of cultural activity. It was precisely because it had no place for God, or Christ, or for the Church, that such a system devised by men's pride was anathematised by your Predecessors.

You, on the other hand, are reckless enough not only to accept these ideas but even to propagate them: "Isolation is no longer permissible: the hour has come when there shall be a great solidarity among men and when there shall be set up a world-wide community of brotherhood." (****) And you give your approval to the total omission of religion or any discrimination on the grounds of religion, from such a community: "The work of peace is not limited to any particular religious belief: it is the task and the duty of every human being regardless of his religious convictions. Men are brothers, God is their Father, and their Father desires them to live at peace with one another, as brothers should." (*****) So it is God who does not wish to be a source of dispute among men! It is God who desires such total religious toleration, indifferentism, liberalism in society! It is God Himself who desires men to be indifferent towards God!

"It is a question...of building a world where every man, no matter what his race, religion (the underlining is mine) or nationality, can live a fully human life.... (*) And elsewhere (++) , discussing the various factors on account of which human beings "are discriminated against", we hear them all mentioned together - "racial origin, colour, sex or religion." It is the Pope who thus speaks of religion as though it were on a level with colour, sex, culture, whatever you please. Does it really mean nothing for you except as a source of discrimination, like the others? Does it mean anything at all?

(*) Populorum Progressio, 34

(**) Letter on the Sillon, 25th August 1910

(***) Referring to Antichrist - in a book by Mgr Benson.

(****) Address in Sydney, 3rd Dec. 1970

(*****) Address given to the religious bodies at the United Nations, 4th Oct. 1965

(+) Populorum Progressio, No 47

(++) Letter to Cardinal Roy. (See CRC No 45, CCR 17)

A SPIRITUAL ANIMATION.

While taking for granted that secular society does not acknowledge any religion, is not prepared to serve any God, you hope nevertheless that religion might somehow make itself acceptable by creeping in at a back door, as the servant of the World which has no use for it, convinced that it still has significant services to offer.

"The Church cannot remain indifferent to the ideological, moral and spiritual animation of public life... Play your part with confidence therefore, yes with confidence, in those Institutions which represent the norms of our society, and which in our day and age are democratic institutions." (*) These words give a clue to your thinking, to those of us at least who are familiar with the ideas of Sangnier: that Democracy, in order to survive, must be closely linked with Christianity, and with those of Maritain, that a "complete humanism" must find its ideological basis in a secular transposition of the Gospel.

And so, whereas formerly it was the Queen, with all other human things subordinated to it, Religion in the New Democracy has no particular standing. Therefore it will play the part of servant and find that it still has a worthwhile task to accomplish, aiding man and humanity. For this it must take on an anonymous, secular guise. "We feel ourselves responsible. We owe something to everybody. The Church in this world is not an end for itself; it is, rather, in the service of all peoples, it must render Christ present to all, individuals as well as nations." (**) What are we to understand by the "presence of Christ"? His presence as a servant... "To serve man, which means, every human being, whatever his condition, his wretchedness, his needs. The Church has, so to speak, proclaimed itself the servant of mankind." (***)

This service of mankind by the Church, though necessarily secular and playing only a background role, is still seen, in your earlier thinking, as remarkably conservative: "While other philosophies would propose quite different bases for the building of the city of men - such as power, riches, science, contestation, self-interest, etc., the Church proclaims nothing but love." (**)

Forgive me if I quote in full the following passage, from your Discourse on Corpus Christi 1965, because it is one of very great significance:

"You know that today the problem of the social character of human existence surpasses all others in importance, in view of the various ideologies, political and cultural systems for which men work and toil, about which they dream or under which they suffer, for their aim is to create the new earthly city, the new and ideal society. And we all know that, as the result of great efforts, those engaged in this vast construction have made some remarkable advances; worthy of our admiration and encouragement, most certainly, but we know also that at each step they find within themselves obstacles and perversities which lead to dissensions, struggles, and wars, precisely because they lack a unique and transcendent principle capable of unifying this vast collection of individuals, because they lack a moral energy capable of giving to this collection a coherence that is both free and conscious of itself, both solid and happy, a coherence that becomes true men. The earthly city lacks a supplement of faith and love which it cannot find within itself nor by its own powers and which only the city of religion which exists in its midst, which only the Church can bestow upon it, and this in no insignificant measure - without, however, offending in any way against the autonomy, the justifiedly secular character of the earthly city, but merely through a silent osmosis of example and spiritual virtue..."

You, the citizens of this modern estate, you have here in front of you a typical example of the new, ideal way of life. Do not permit it to go without that inward animation which is able to render it truly unanimous, good, and happy, that animation which comes to it from the fountain which is the Catholic Faith lived in the communal celebration of the Eucharistic Liturgy." (****)

I did not have to look far for an example of your spiritual adultery, of your betrayal of the charge entrusted to you by Christ. But I seem to have been the only one to remark upon it. Your Discourse is skilful, and if taken in one way, it could be true and exemplary: the Eucharist unifies, strengthens, sanctifies the Church; the Church shines forth upon the earthly city the peace, the charity, the law of Jesus Christ and thereby

(*) Discourse given on 30th January 1965

(**) Discourse given on 14th September 1965

(***) Discourse given on 7th December 1965

(****) Cited in Documentations Catholiques 65, 1168-69.

repels the darkness and the powers of Satan....that is Christendom. But this is not what you are speaking about here. No, you put the city of men, the Kingdom of Satan, the marvels created by human pride, into the foremost place. That is your new, ideal City - a secular creation which you wish to fortify with the Christian leaven rather than cursing it as a house built in defiance of the Lord. But you reach the height of impiety when you approximate this eucharistic fervour with your humanistic cult, when you appeal to this "supplement of faith and love" to come to the aid of your Tower of Babel. For the "osmosis" to which you appeal will work the other way, and the faith in Jesus Christ, the love of God, in the hearts of the faithful whom you lead astray, will soon turn into faith in man and love of the World!

You would have the Church make an adulterous use of those heavenly gifts bestowed upon her by her Lord, to be used for Him, and put them into the service of the enterprises invented by Man-who-would-make-himself-God. "The religion of God made Man" is called upon by you to enter into the service of "the religion (for there is such a one) of man who makes himself god." But is that not a work of Antichrist?

RELIGION DEVALUED.

You remained hopeful of achieving a synthesis between the Catholic religion and the new idea of "service", with all the "updating" of the former which this must necessarily involve. And it appears that your hope was not a vain one, for you were allowed to have your way, with almost everybody else falling into line. But few had any idea of where the changes were to lead which you sought to impose upon all in the name of Christ, when they heard you say, at Bethlehem on 6th January 1964: "We must assure to the life of the Church a new manner of feeling, desiring, behaving."

Your way of expressing yourself had grown bolder by 12th August 1970: "Religion must be renewed. All who are still today concerned about religion are convinced of this, regardless of whether or not they are members of a religion as it finds expression in a particular faith, a definite observance, a defined community. The question at issue is what meaning we are to give to the term 'renewal'." Such a statement leads one to think that you must have lost the Catholic Faith - any Christian Faith, indeed your very sense of religion. For you speak of "religion" as though it were a purely human phenomenon, endowed with a certain power of emotion, of moral energy, which can be put to good use in the service of mankind and its worldly advance. For you are certainly among those "who are still today concerned about religion", but who no longer have any very clear idea why, or what it really means.

Hence the call to all the different religions to fraternise, to work together in the temporal task which has become a new reason for their existence: because this is common to all of them, dogmatic quarrels are a thing of the past, "the wars of religion are over for good" (*). "Fanaticism" and "proselytism" also are dead, for we are no longer concerned about winning souls for the "supreme things" (**), but only with putting them into the service of humanity. The different gods are to be forcibly reconciled by their priests who have decided all to work together in the interests of human success. For that is what Ecumenism means.

This confusion of the different religions, all considered as multiple and convergent expressions of the same "spiritual values" offered to "men of good will" for the "salvation" of all and every man upon earth, appears over and over again in the course of your journey to the Far East. (***) You include even Buddhism among the religions. Was it not the main purpose of your journey to ripen "the fruits of a closer understanding between the communities of different origin and different denomination in this part of the world, as an encouragement of solidarity for progress, justice and peace." (****)

"With no distinction of caste, of faith, of colour, or of language", was what you said at Ceylon (*****). And because in your eyes Love is enough to banish all distinctions, you carried this appeal, addressed indiscriminately to all the spiritual forces, to the length of including even Communist China, because towards that too, you feel nothing but Love. (*****)

(*) 15th February 1965

(**) Discourse of 7th December 1965

(***) The Pope's addresses during this journey are quoted and discussed in CRC 41, and, in the English Edition, CCR 13.

(****) Address given at Teheran on 26th November 1970

(*****) Ceylon, 4th December 1970.

I will remind you of only a single one of the discourses in which you speak about the coexistence and collaboration of the religions, and I will ask you only one question concerning it: as the Judge of the Faith, can you tell us whether the speaker is still a Catholic, or whether he has denied Christ and placed himself outside the Church. Here is the text, it relates to the conflict in the Middle East and your hopes of peace:

"And We have a hope which may appear Utopian because it does not rest on any concrete basis, and may even itself represent a point of discord but which We consider to be founded upon an argument that is solid and practical: the conflict involves three different ethnico-religious groups, all of which recognise a one and true God: the Hebrew people, the Islamic people and between them, and scattered throughout the entire world, the Christian people. These three expressions of an identical monotheism speak with the most authentic and ancient, and even the boldest and most confident, the most convinced voices. Can we therefore not hope that the name of the same God, instead of engendering irreconcilable opposition, should lead rather to mutual respect, understanding and peaceful coexistence? Should the reference to the same God, the same Father, WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS, not lead us rather one day to discover what is so evident, yet so difficult, that we are all sons of the same Father and that, therefore, we are all brothers?"(*)

Well, here is the reply: "Strange indeed, and both sad and terrifying, are the audacity and rashness of spirit of men who call themselves Catholic and dream of founding society anew in such conditions and of establishing upon earth, independently of the Catholic Church, 'the reign of justice and of love', with the help of all who come, of whatever religion or none at all, with or without beliefs, provided only that they are prepared to forget that which divides them - their religious and philosophical beliefs, and to concentrate on what unites them - a generous idealism and certain moral forces 'of whatever origin'. It is frightening... The result of such promiscuity of labour, the beneficiary of such cosmopolitan social action can only be a democracy which is neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish: a religion more universal than the Catholic Church, uniting all men thus finally become brothers and comrades in 'the reign of God'. 'To work no longer for the Church, but for mankind'...this is organised Apostasy." (**)

The reply was given by St Pius X. Whose word speaks louder in our souls - yours - or his? Which of the two is the apostate?

RELIGION, A FORCE FOR UTOPIANISM AND CONTESTATION.

And finally, carrying things to absurdity, and changing your tune to correspond with current revolutionary fashion, you are today ascribing a totally different function to Christians in the world from the one you preached ten years ago. At that time, not yet conscious of any revolutionary stirring, you looked upon Satan as nothing worse than a peaceloving builder of a middle-class democracy, and you assured him of the Church's support in the creation of this United Nations phalanstery... But today you are determined to see good even in the "Christian communities of the base", revolutionary and anarchical as these are. Is it because Satan has advanced another step in his destructive efforts and you cannot resist playing into his hands?

Your Letter to Cardinal Roy (***) is your appeal to the Red Guards of the Cultural Revolution: "The church invites all Christians to take up a double task of inspiring and of innovating, in order to make structures evolve, so as to adapt them to the real needs of today." And among the various political ideologies which you survey, it is the Utopia which stands out in your mind as best conforming with the creative dynamism of the "Spirit". "And if it refuses no overture, it (the Utopia) can also meet the Christian appeal. The Spirit of the Lord, which animates man renewed in Christ, causes a constant movement of those horizons which his intelligence would prefer to regard as fixed, and of the boundaries within which he would so gladly find security. There is a force within man which calls upon him to pass beyond the limits of every system and every ideology..." It seems that the same "Spirit" which seven years before called upon the Christian Democrat citizen of Rome to play his part in developing the well-being, comfort and progress of his existing society, now calls upon his sons to play their part in the destruction of this abominable "Western consumer society". You are at all events following the fashionable trend.

But is it not the final downfall of the adulterous woman to give herself in the end to all and sundry?

(*) Address given at the Angelus on 9th August 1970

(**) St Pius X, Letter on the Sillon.

(***) Apostolic Letter to Cardinal Roy, 14th May 1971

THE DEATH OF ALL RELIGION.

It is as a result of your obsessive preoccupation with the building of the Brave New World, with the most irresponsible, ill-defined, anarchical political systems ever invented, that the Church has for the past ten years been undergoing an appalling disintegration. For you do not allow her to breathe, you force her, drugged into submission, into the shape of your own ideas. In your system, the Church's dogmas, clear and constant, have become so many obstacles to universal understanding and hence they are said to hinder fraternity. The Sacraments, at first still acceptable as sources of spiritual strength that aid men in their temporal tasks, soon appear useless because the rest of mankind can do just as good a day's work on the building site of the world as we can, without any recourse to them. The Commandments of God are at first twisted and distorted to make them fit into the system of the builders, and finally thrown aside altogether as intolerable burdens.

And finally, the whole Institution of the Church begins to crumble. Set apart from the rest of the world, distinct in her way of life, of thinking, of education, her defences are breached as a result of your instructions to become integrated into the world, into secular society, as a "leaven in the dough" and give up her distinctive character. But one day, the idea of being a "leaven" itself becomes a sign of pride, and condemned as Pharisaic. On that day, the Christian will deny that he is any different from the rest and thereby, if unknowingly, complete his path of apostasy in your footsteps. Your "complete humanism" will have effectively smothered its enemy, Religion, and completed its metamorphosis into atheistic humanism.

In August 1971 I placed side by side for comparison a collection of your discourses on the one hand and the Letter on the Sillon on the other. (*) In other words, the Catholic Religion on the one hand, and your political Utopianism on the other. This was my conclusion, with which few readers would be prepared to disagree: "Pius X was canonised primarily for the purity of his teaching and his strength of soul in defending the Catholic Faith. He is and remains the great Doctor of the Faith in the 20th century...It follows that Paul VI will one day be anathematised primarily on account of his Utopian M.A.S.D.U. which had been condemned in advance (by his holy Predecessor). He is and remains the great Corruptor of the Faith in the 20th century.

We appeal to your Infallible Magisterium for a verdict on this statement.

(*) CRC No 47. The translation of this issue had to be deferred as no English translation of the Letter on the Sillon was available.

II - YOUR FAR-REACHING CONDONATION OF HERESY.

For the simple faithful it remains incomprehensible that Your Holiness should, on the one hand, frequently and with every appearance of firmness, reiterate the Catholic Faith, and on the other, allow free rein to all the possible and imaginable heresies without ever taking firm steps against those who conceive and propagate these. They like to recall your Encyclical Mysterium Fidei of 1965, Sacerdotalis Coelibatus of 1967, your Profession of Faith and your courageous Encyclical Humanae Vitae, both of the same year 1968, for these echo the authentic Catholic Tradition. To these doctrinal acts of your Ordinary Magisterium therefore, they subscribe - in their great majority, with their whole Faith. They have correspondingly resented bitterly the organised opposition and systematic criticism of these Acts of your Magisterium on the part of so many priests and bishops, indeed of entire national hierarchies. Such insubordination or affectation of ignorance is profoundly shocking to the best of your children, but they are no less shocked that you should tolerate it. The truly Catholic spirit fails to understand an attitude which, while affirming the truth, will not condemn error.

Similarly, the faithful are astounded at the increasing contradiction between the traditional teaching which, with only occasional exceptions, they hear expounded in your Wednesday Allocutions, and the flood of madness which is freely taught throughout the Church. They are amazed that the uproar created by bad theologians and self-styled moralists against your Encyclical Humanae Vitae should have put you off writing any further Encyclicals for these past five years, making it seem as though you had abandoned the struggle and left your sheep in the hands of the false shepherds...

Such weakness is something nobody can understand, though they may make excuses for you, on the grounds of the difficulty of your task, the hardness of the times we live in, the threats of schism... Such filial confidence and submissive patience on the part of the faithful would be a good thing if it did not lead to the creation of an artificial, misleading contrast between our modernist priests and bishops on the one hand, and Your Holiness on the other, whose teaching and acts continue to be regarded as uniformly holy and traditional. For such an attitude represents an injustice towards our bishops and priests, the majority of whom would have remained free of guilt if you yourself had kept them firmly in the straight path of orthodoxy. You yourself are the first and foremost cause of today's inexplicable toleration of every form of error at every level of the Church. You are of course not the only one responsible, but you bear a special and supreme responsibility because the others are, directly or indirectly, following your example or precept.

That is why we accuse you of seriously condoning all the heresies that are springing up in every sphere and in every part of the Church. Even those heresies which you do not share in any way, which fill you with horror, are receiving your indirect support through the mere fact that you are not prepared to bring any sanctions against them. It follows naturally that the worst heresy-mongers take advantage of your inertia to spread abroad their poison. You are guilty by your indifference, in the same manner that Pope Honorius merited the terrible sanction of an Anathema; but this is not all, for in many cases you have done more and shown some favour towards the errors of error or pernicious novelties. You may have paid them a passing compliment, or rescued them from your own disciplinary courts, or even named them for some appointment, as though you felt a constant need to keep on their right side, to show your friendship for them... just as though you felt yourself in sympathy with them in your and their common cause of promoting the Conciliar Reformation and establishing a new Church.

I have already given the reasons underlying this inaction and lack of concern, by which you render yourself an accomplice. In the first place, you are anxious to be on good terms with all men, including even atheists and communists, and this desire for dialogue with the adversaries outside the Church leads you also to respect and honour their friends within. Thus, in your desire for reconciliation with the Protestants, you not only avoid any mention of the condemnations of the past but also any suppression, by way of new condemnation, of the protestantisation of the Church which is going on today. And so on and so forth. This tolerance towards anything and everything constitutes your liberalism.

A second and more deepseated reason is that you are genuinely convinced that the language of our dogma and canonical discipline requires a profound revision in the interests of dialogue with the world, that it must be adapted to present day ways of living and thinking. Because you believe this, you are in two minds at least even when faced with truly revolutionary formulations. You wonder whether, even if today

they seem too extreme, they may not represent the hallowed forms of tomorrow, a futuristic appearance of the Faith rather than its corruption. This attitude is a consequence of your Evolutionism.

Finally, the chief reason for your flirtation with every kind of heresy lies in the fact that there is no real link between your politico-religious Utopia on the one hand, and your religious Faith in the proper, dogmatic sense of the word, on the other: they occupy entirely separate pigeon-holes of your mind. I dare not think that you have a full realisation of this contradiction between the two, for in that case your guilt would indeed be beyond measure. But you are conscious of it to the extent that you experience a constant unease, a feeling of being drawn this way and that: while the Faith would seem in your eyes useless and uninspiring, you have not attempted to graft your Utopia formally on to your Credo. You teach the traditional Faith on Wednesdays and betray it on Sundays. But you are conscious of the solidarity and mutual sympathy between your own political Utopia and the prevalent dogmatic and moral heresies which nevertheless you cannot subscribe to. And so you tolerate them and even show a certain active sympathy towards them. This is where your Modernism comes in.

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

Why have you not condemned Teilhard? The immense harm done by Teilhardism is common knowledge today. And, though the star of the evolutionary Jesuit may have paled considerably, this is not because of any general realisation of his errors but rather because present day opinion has far outstripped these. Not only did you not condemn him, but at the very moment when everybody was expecting from you some reaction to the world-wide campaign being waged on his behalf by the Friends of Teilhard, you reacted, not with any clearcut comment, favourable or unfavourable, but by praising him in a subtle manner, thus destroying the last bastions:

We heard that on 24th February 1966, in the course of a visit to the Pharmaceutical Laboratories, "The Holy Father then made a reference to Teilhard, who had given an explanation of the universe and who... had seen in the sensory world evidence of an intelligent principle which could only be referred to as God." Man was learning how to engage in "this vast dialogue with the universe and... was sending up a hymn to God, creator and father of all." The few extracts from your remarks which were reported in the press were enough to illustrate the affinity between the vague Deism of Teilhard and your own way of thinking. His pantheistic evolutionism provides an ideal setting for your own progressist Utopianism, incompatible as it must necessarily be with your truly Catholic Faith. The convergence of all men and all religions towards a single aim of ideal perfection is also one that appeals to you.

You are aware that the weakness of his philosophy, the one which caused him to be censured by Rome, was his rejection of Original Sin, as entirely incompatible with the idea of continuous progress which forms its cornerstone. For you do believe in Original Sin: you recalled the doctrine in formal terms, in accordance with the teaching of the Council of Trent, at the Theological Symposium held on 21st July 1966; only, unfortunately, no one there took much notice of what you said. But the fact is that your whole theory of universal Peace and inevitable Progress of world civilisation represents a contradiction of that Faith which you affirmed then and is entirely in line with the heresy of Teilhard.

We can go even further. The central point of our religion is the Cross of Christ, by which we are redeemed: the Propitiatory Sacrifice of Calvary, which is also the Sacrifice of the Mass. This Mystery is totally alien to the cosmic pantheism of Teilhard. But - saving your respect - it would seem to be almost as alien to your own personal view of the world and of history! Perhaps you would care to re-read your Address to the United Nations, your Discourse of 7th December 1965, to the Council, Ecclesiam Suam, Populorum Progressio, Octogesima Adveniens... The Cross of Christ has no place in these either, or receives at most some rhetorical allusion. For your philosophy too, is one in which man advances through his own efforts. In order to condemn Teilhard, you would have to define wherein his error lay. And in defining his error you would be condemning yourself also. And so, when you refuse to condemn him, and even praise him, though admitting that there is much that is "fanciful" in his philosophy, you are instinctively protecting also your own sayings, which include the same, unspecified, "fanciful" notions.

And so, for the past ten years, Teilhardism has been corrupting the Church's Faith and Morals and shows no sign of yielding up the microphones of our parish churches, except to those who teach even worse heresies.

If I have been lying, then condemn the errors of Teilhard!

THE DUTCH CATECHISM

The whole shocking story of the Dutch Catechism, of its troubles with Rome, and of its diffusion throughout the world in spite of these, is too well known for me to remind you of it here. The affair is one of the most serious of those that have taken place under your Pontificate.

There are two separate, contradictory aspects to the story: the efforts to suppress it made by Rome on the one hand, and your own weakness on the other. The first is common knowledge, and it does credit to Rome, its Curia and Cardinals. And you yourself, in your Credo, gave a point by point reply to all the heresies contained in this so-called "Catechism". It was just then that I had been invited to the Holy Office for the instruction of my Process, and I can assure you that there was great joy there at the prospect of an imminent Defence of the True Faith by the Pope. Indeed I was discreetly assured that I could sign my recantation with full confidence in the Pope who was about to restore the Faith throughout the Church in a resounding and wonderful manner. That was in May 1968. So we know that all the pernicious errors of this Catechism had already been noted and listed, and pointed out to the authors. And the Pope had solemnly proclaimed his Catholic Faith, in clear contradiction to them.

The other side of the story is one calculated to plunge all good Catholics into deep distress: they are at a loss for a good word to say on your behalf. For it became clear that you were giving up the fight and admitting defeat by a handful of Modernist theologians who, in thus insulting the Curia and its worthy Cardinals had insulted also, not only the Pope himself but the whole Church, and God! You let this venomous book become disseminated throughout the Church without insisting on any of the corrections demanded by the Roman Commission, not daring to raise a little finger in reproach against any of those immediately responsible.

During this time I was making a detailed study of the work (*) with the aim of defending souls against its deadly poison, but it was to be myself who was disowned by you, and not the authors. In conclusion of my study I wrote the following words: "The very silence of the Supreme Authority of the Church represents collusion with heresy and strikes a deadly blow at the Faith." Those Church Authorities who, in past times, had thus kept silent in the face of schism and heresy were later declared to have been themselves guilty of heresy - such as the Council of Rimini and Seleucia, and Pope Honorius. The inviolable certainty of the Faith and the dignity of the Supreme Magisterium could be restored only by condemning those who had remained silent in the face of error."

But you did more than merely remain silent.....For before long you were joining in the chorus of admiration for the new heresy. Italy had a new Catechism, based partly on the "famous Dutch Catechism" and partly upon that of Isolotto - that revolutionary parish in Florence about which you know well enough; and there was your voice showering praise upon this offspring of the most extreme forms of Modernism and Progressism: "It is a document inspired by the charity of pedagogic dialogue that witnesses to the desire and the art of speaking in a simple and persuasive manner, suited to the mentality of modern man. We shall do well to give it an important place and make it the starting point of a great, harmonious, and untiring renewal of catechetics for the present generation. This requires that the Magisterium of the Church should present a functional character(?): we owe it our respect and confidence." (**)

My comment on this, admittedly polemical, was as follows: "The Supreme Authority has yielded and abandoned the field to the Modernist heresy. Like a good sportsman, the Pope respects and congratulates his victorious opponent. How noble and generous that Rome should thus acclaim the Batavian heresy! But what has happened to the Credo of yesterday?" May God forgive me my virulent tone! But I was filled with a most holy wrath on thinking of those thousands and thousands of souls now left to the mercy of these "assassins of the Faith" to which your friend Cardinal Daniélou makes frequent references, without, however, naming any names. I was thinking how through your "good sportsmanship" you were allowing the souls of your people to be perverted.

But your desire to please does not explain everything. I need only re-read what I wrote at the time in the CRC to understand just why you were able to accept the Dutch Catechism: "In this Catechism, God does not appear as essentially different from, as other than man and the world. He is referred to, admittedly as "the Other" but only as representing in some way the mysterious essence of our being...never as a Transcendent Being, fully and sovereignly independent with regard to His creation. Instead, he ap-

(*) A series of articles appearing in the (French) CRC Nos 20, 21, 31, 32, 34, 35. They are available in English in booklet form.

(**) Papal Address to Italian Bishops' Conference, reported in La Croix, 11th Ap. 1970.

pears as necessarily in agreement with man. Conflict or contradiction between God and man, or the possibility of a final break, seem excluded a priori. Sin matters only in so far as its visible consequences are concerned, apart from these it becomes a matter of rhetoric. God is always on the side of man, concerned only for his happiness and fighting to win this for him. Such a relationship rules out any idea of just punishment and leaves room only for an unconditional love. God forgives anything and everything; He forgives all men and at all times, for He is full of love! Such a system has no place for the Mystery of the Redemption... Religion merges into everyday life, without any discontinuity, bringing to it a "spiritual supplement", the fulfilment of man's inmost aspirations."

Let me stop here. I could go on, repeating what I wrote then...for we have here the heterodoxy which corresponds to your heteropraxis. You merely act as though God's love were unconditional, whereas they say so in so many words. You act as though the "religious sentiment" were merely a spiritual supplement arising from man's conscience, while they actually tell us so. And so on and so forth.

You are just not able to condemn the Dutch Catechism, any more than Teilhard. You uphold their freedom of thought because you also have need of it for your own fanciful ideas. And the new world of brotherhood which you seek to build is incompatible with any discussion of dogmatic questions. But the main reason is that - even if you dare not admit it - the humanistic Modernism of this book forms an excellent doctrinal basis for your own progressist humanism. It is indeed a measure of the success of this perverted catechism that your own Utopian delusions no longer seem heretical to anybody...

If I have not spoken the truth, then condemn the Dutch Catechism!

THE NEW CATECHETICS.

While all these discussions were going on the Episcopates - those faceless and irresponsible collective entities - of France, Canada, Germany, the USA, of all parts of the world that is, launched their new Catechisms for children, all absolutely revolutionary. These books were intended only to serve as teaching aids to a system of live catechetical instruction based on pure immanentism, as I showed conclusively in my study on the French Fonds Commun Obligatoire. Let me just repeat some of the subheadings of that study: "Illuminism replaces the Faith"... "The appeal to the illusion of vital religious experience"... "The reading of the 'signs of the times' nurtures this illuminism"... Believe me, Most Holy Father, when I wrote this I was not thinking in any way of you, of your repeated appeals to religious experience, to the "signs of the times", of your implied direct inspiration by the Spirit...but reading these words again, with yours, the closeness between the two shows itself forcefully. It represents also your philosophy, at least your personal feelings.

This study is contained in the CRC for April 1968 - which was the very time when I was summoned to Rome to account for my criticisms of the Pope and the Council. Perhaps they told you of this little episode? In the course of the first session of the Instruction of my Process I laid in front of the Judges this Fonds Commun Obligatoire, and told them that this text, the blueprint for all the new catechetical texts which were shortly to appear, represented a systematic perversion of the Faith. They refused to take the book, protested at the digression and went on with my Process. But, between sessions, one of the consultants tried to set my mind at rest and very solemnly assured me that Rome had not allowed and would never allow the diffusion of a catechism tainted with heresy.

But the catechisms did appear. I devoted all my energy to their refutation, in writing, in the CRC, during the second half of 1968 and also by word of mouth in the course of a veritable crusade of lectures given all over France, together with the Abbé Coache, Père Barbara, the Brothers of my Community and other occasional co-workers. The halls filled with people witnessed to the anguish of those Catholic families. Why was our effort not successful? Because you stood in the way of it, Most Holy Father. You chose Cardinal Lefebvre, a member of the Holy Office and one of my judges but also the one who, in his capacity of Chairman of the Gallican Episcopate, bore the greatest responsibility for this doctrinal corruption, to present me with an ultimatum to recant and keep quiet. And when I refused to regard one who had shown himself so false and unworthy, as the authoritative representative of the Holy See, you applied to me your rough justice, and I was declared "disqualified", which brought our crusade to an end.

I have thus good grounds for saying that this poisoning of generations of little baptised Catholics by these numerous new catechisms, all modernistic, progressist, erotic and subversive, is your doing. You bear the supreme responsibility for the spiritual

assassination of our children. Each one of these souls - and they will be counted in their millions - is a victim of your crime.

It will be no use your saying, at the Judgement Seat of God, that you did not know anything about it. Such excuses don't hold water, up there. And if you should at some time bring forward such an excuse before the Tribunal of Rome, then I myself will contest it. I know your bishops, our priests, our well-meaning catechists, well enough. If it had not been for your active support of that handful of poisoners - already known to and indeed shifted from their posts by Pius XII - then the good old Catechism would have gone on being taught, with its sound Catholic contents and teaching methods that are much better than those of the present works.

And please don't quote to me the "Pastoral Catechetical Directory" either, for that is but a mixture of truth and falsehood in equal parts. The only people who objected to it were the traditionalists, because they will not stand for any error being mixed in among the truth. If the New Catechetics is allowed to continue, it will mean an end to the Church. But clearly it will not be your Holiness that puts a stop to it, for it is too closely entangled with your personal heresy - besides some three dozen others, all of them converging upon that Cult of Man which forms your own religion.

If I am telling lies, then why do you not condemn these perverse catechisms?

AGAINST CARDINAL OTTAVIANI.

You are aware, Most Holy Father, of the full extent of this aged Cardinal's loyalty to the person of the Pope as such. And that when, taunted for his defence of the Holy Office from the beginning of the First Session of Vatican II, he was ordered by yourself to keep quiet and let you do any defending of what was being attacked, he obeyed and said no more. He saw himself only as the armed guard on duty outside your stronghold, the treasure within which you were at liberty to change at will, even to replace by a pile of pebbles. Whatever you decide to place there, he will defend against the enemy from without. That this enemy could be his own master is for him inconceivable.

In accordance with his duty as guard, he wrote a Letter to the Bishops of the world on 24th July 1966, to alert them to ten serious errors or dangerous opinions which had already spread sufficiently to cause concern. The French Bishops' reply was evasive, while that of the Dutch was a systematic defence both of the "errors" against which the warning had been issued and of those who were spreading them. The text of this reply (which was made public in 1968) was, incidentally, prepared by one of the chief heresy mongers, the Rev. Schillebeeckx. But, fearing the worst and intent on taking advance precautions, he had the cheek to warn Rome not to have recourse to any condemnations - or else!

It was in defiance of the Church of Rome and your own Sovereign Authority that some of the most important points of the Faith had thus been publicly challenged: the Sources of Revelation, the unchanging character of dogmatic definitions, the Divinity of Christ, the physical Virginity of Mary, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacrament of Penance, Original Sin, and several important moral and pastoral principles... But you just stood by. They had thrown down their challenge, and to make a formal break would have meant admitting their defeat. And this was the Year of Faith! I am quite sure, myself, that you do not share a single one of the errors denounced by the Holy Office. You even went so far as to express your beliefs in public: why then did you stop short of saying that they were binding upon the whole Church? Instead, we heard solemn promises that you would never exercise constraint upon anyone. But are you not the Pope? You behave like somebody who has been seized with doubt, but decides to retain his old beliefs, now as mere personal opinions. I should like to think that your faith is strong and firm and that it is vitiated only by your liberalism, being drowned bit by bit in your dreams about the Faith in Man, the Love of Man, the Cult of Man. But for all practical purposes it is the same as if you had lost the Faith. Indeed, it is even worse, because your personal opinion gives people a sense of false security with regard to your actions as Pope.

The fact remains that your Credo is everywhere trampled under foot. Anybody, anywhere, can spread what heresy he likes, however outrageous a denial of our dogmas or of our moral law. Whose fault is this? Your own, Most Holy Father, for it was you who destroyed the vigilance of the Curia, who laid low "the great Ottaviani", who has become the protector of all heresies, which it would be your duty to banish from the Church, even at the cost of your life.

If I am wrong, then condemn the ten errors defended by the Dutch bishops!

AGAINST CARDINAL WRIGHT.

This is a much more recent story, and one of which you have first-hand knowledge. We know it too, inside out, and the last word has only just been spoken. The Document emanating from the Congregation for the Clergy, and relating to certain "Acts of the Spanish Priest-Bishops' Assembly" of September 1971 constitutes - if you will forgive my quoting what I wrote myself - "the strongest doctrinal condemnation of post-Conciliar Modernism and Progressism. It is a document which will remain as part of the continuing Tradition of the Catholic Magisterium, and take its place alongside the last indisputable Act of that Magisterium - the Encyclical *Humani Generis* of Pius XII, dated 15th August 1950."

Perhaps we may continue by reading what I wrote then (*), when all the documents had been made public: "What does it matter that Cardinal Tarancon, the leader of Spanish Progressism, was saved from the effects of this mortal blow by the intervention of Cardinal Villot, Secretary of State, and warmly consoled by the Pope himself. They both assured him that they had had no knowledge of this document and that no special authority attached to it, but neither dared say to Cardinal Tarancon that he was right, and Cardinal Wright was wrong. So the fact remains that it was Cardinal Wright who had written in accordance with the Faith. If the Pope and his Secretary of State choose to fraternise with Error, that is their business. A glimmer of Truth has nevertheless appeared to lighten the skies of Rome after a long period of darkness, and this is enough to hold out hope for Christendom. Rome has spoken."

Yes, but when Rome spoke out it was in spite of you. And after you are gone, she will speak out again!

I am not straying from the theme of this my Act of Accusation, Most Holy Father, if I repeat to you the Conclusions of the Catholic Counter-Reformation, as I wrote them down after quoting the relevant Document:

"1) This is the most serious aspect of the present affair: Nobody has attempted to deny that the acts of this Spanish Assembly 'appear (in the words of the Document) to be unacceptable both from the doctrinal and from the pastoral point of view'. This fact is all too evident. The Assembly itself was irregular in the extreme, as the Roman Document indicates... The intentional ambiguity that characterises the statements shows that it was the subversive and hypocritical mafia who had a majority in the Assembly. When Cardinal Wright rose up to protest, it was Rome herself, faithful to her divine mission, who rose up against this two-fold heresy of doctrinal Neomodernism and revolutionary Progressism.

2) We are forced to admit that in the last resort it was through the intervention of Paul VI and his Secretary of State that this mafia was finally saved, in a manner that is a scandal to the entire world. And it was saved because the brief it held was that of fidelity to Vatican II and to the Acts of the present Pontiff: 'Its various initiatives for the renewal of the Church undertaken in conformity with the directives of the Second Vatican Council and with the Pontifical Documents...' This conformity, affirmed by the Supreme Authority, of all the errors, modernist and revolutionary, to the Council and to the Acts of the Pope - and in contradiction to the entire Tradition of the Roman Magisterium, serves to carry dissension into the very heart of the Church, of Rome, and of the Pope himself.

3) Certain of our readers will have noted the close agreement - going sometimes so far as the use of identical expressions - between the critical study of the Spanish Assembly by Cardinal Wright and the critical study of the Acts of Vatican II by the Catholic Counter-Reformation. (**) The document issued by the Congregation for the Clergy merits to be retained as an Act of the Ordinary Roman Magisterium in preparation for the Third Vatican Council, which is to be the Council of Catholic Restoration."

The doctrinal conclusion is clear-cut. You have taken sides against the Catholic Faith, out of sympathy for and complicity with the subversive side in Spain. On a human level, the conclusion is disastrous: You have just named Mgr Romero de Lima, a member of the Spanish progressist mafia, Secretary to the Congregation for the Clergy. We read that "he is among the team bent on 'Conciliar Renewal' surrounding Cardinal Tarancon. It is known that an attempt had been made on the part of the Congregation for the Clergy to prevent the election of the latter to the chairmanship of the Spanish Bishops' Conference (the affair of the 'Document')". Today it is a Spanish Bishop, a

(*) CRC No 56. CCR (English Ed.) No 27

(**) A series of articles "Preparing for Vatican III", containing a study of the Acts of Vatican II appears in CRC Nos 51 to 61 inclusive, and, in abridged form, in CCR (English Ed.) No 22 and subsequent issues.

friend of the Cardinal, who will be in charge of the functions of the Congregation for the Clergy." (*) We have a proverb which says that "revenge is a dish which is eaten cold". Your friends cannot wait to have their revenge, and I feel great pity for the true servants of the Church who fall into your hands.

But the Truth of the Lord shall remain for ever.

A WHOLE SWARM OF HERESIES.

What is the point of giving more and more examples? These and many equally well-established facts, known to all the Bishops, Superiors of Orders, Directors of Seminaries, Rectors of Catholic universities, are enough to show those who have any position of authority in the Church that while Paul VI remains Pope, they must not condemn anybody or fight any error or indiscipline. There was to be "no constraint, no prohibition". And so the flood of heresy and impiety began to rise suddenly and simultaneously the world over, until today it is hitting back at the Church, causing her to complain that the world has turned very wicked!

The truth is very different, and a small handful of agitators are laughing behind the backs of three thousand bishops and of Rome itself.

Do you remember Cardonnel? When he was asked, around May 1968, to provide some explanation of his incendiary writings, even his best friends began to draw away from him, realising he had gone too far. Had you condemned him then, it would have saved him. And there would have been no protests. He tells the story himself in his book: "I espoused the Word." Instead, he produced his "Profession of faith" - with barely an attempt to disguise his heresy - and presented it to Cardinal Lefebvre, who is always the one chosen for this sort of task. And we read, in Cardonnel's own words: "Thanks to Cardinal Lefebvre's good offices, the Pope sent me his congratulations and good wishes for the future." Following his rehabilitation, he has gone from bad to worse, safe from any further interference. His latest effort is a long screed full of hatred against God the Father Himself, whom he likens to Hitler, Stalin, Satan, and then to "a beast". (**) You see where your encouragement of his sin and madness has led him?

If I am wrong, why do you not condemn this abominable book?

And what about Schillebeeckx? One fine day in October 1968, the news leaked out that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith was going to examine his writings. It was his friend Karl Rahner, charged with his defence, who had told the press, in defiance of the confidentiality of the Holy Office. The mafia of "Concilium" protested violently against such an attack upon human rights, freedom of research, the autonomy of theologians...but they could hardly be said to have influenced general opinion, to have caused a public outcry. Yet Rome withdrew...Were you frightened? Most shameful of all, the Congregation denied having even opened any sort of doctrinal process against the Dutch theologian, adding the outrageous comment: "and there is no particular reason why there should have been one." And: "There has not been such a doctrinal process since 1800 at least", at the very moment when - admittedly as a result of my pressure - they were in the middle of my own! Most of the statement is couched in such shameful, servile terms that the Osservatore Romano felt unable to print the rest. The fact remains that the writings of Schillebeeckx contained enough to warrant a doctrinal process that would have served the greater good of the Church and helped to rid her of all heresies. How do you expect those who continue to fight for Truth not to lose heart when they see how ready Rome is to capitulate?

What about Hans Kung? He and I were both summoned before the Holy Office at the same time. I went; he refused to go. And he continues as before to criticise the Church and her divine institutions, while he is photographed, smiling at the Pope's side. He goes on with his "theological updating", and tramples your Humanae Vitae under foot. In his latest book, "Infallible? An Enquiry", he sets about destroying the dogma solemnly proclaimed by the First Vatican Council. The Italian translation of the book has just been published in Rome itself. If you allow this, then we know that everything is permitted, even a direct assault on your own function.

We see now why the Church is full of rot, from her Head down. People don't know what to believe, or whether they are supposed to believe at all. Your friend the Abbé Six, who used to be perfectly reasonable until he was appointed to some Secretariat for Non-believers, now tells them it is natural and honest to have no beliefs, and that we have much to learn from atheists. I mention him among a hundred others because he is a disciple of yours and quotes you in support of this statement, and of his forecast that

(*) La Croix, 22nd March 1973.

(**) This book is reviewed in CRC (French Ed. only), No 63.

Christianity will largely have to give up its place to atheism. For, thanks to you and Vatican II, so he tells us, this has now been rehabilitated, and in this he is right.

Then there is Dom Bernard Besret, one-time Abbot of Boquen and its three monks, who teaches that Christ is God because He is wholly Man! And Hourdin, who told his hundreds of thousands of readers in a perfectly matter-of-fact way that Jesus was the "son of the Virgin Mary and of Joseph the carpenter..." (*). And M. Cesbron, the new Chairman of Catholic Aid, who refuses to refer to the Virgin Mary as Mother of God because this title - proclaimed at the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. - would make her the "creator of the creator"!! Then we have Rev. Xavier Leon-Dufour, who believes that the Body of Jesus must have disintegrated within the tomb in two days, because it could not be found there. "Resurrection" for him means something quite different from the re-animation of the same body... And so on and so forth.

Time and again, we are told that the new ideas, the new "theological research" - in other words, every new form of corruption of the Faith - are vouched for by the Council. And the worst of it is that this is true! The faithful are undergoing a continuous spiritual torture. Present day "catechetics" no longer recognises any distinction between body and soul, or personal survival after death. The existence of Hell is no longer taught, nor do priests today speak of the Bliss of Heaven.

You have indeed succeeded in involving your people in your quest for a political Utopia. Their faith in God has been replaced by faith in man, and they have forgotten all about seeking the Kingdom of God and everlasting life, in their concern with the building of the earthly city. They have deserted the churches because they are concerned only with physical well-being and pleasure. Devotion has gone, leaving only Culture, and the Mass has become the sharing of the same bread in a friendly repast.

The main interest of our priests, and no less of our nuns, consecrated virgins but yesterday, is to find out more and more about sex. To learn the basic facts does not take long, and so they spend hours studying it as an art and a science, with its anomalies and unnatural perversions, together with the various methods of contraception and abortion. Under the Pontificate of Paul VI the Church, once admired by the world for her continence, now leads in the obsession with sex; her theologians are supporting the liberalisation of abortion.

IT IS HIGH TIME TO BREAK WITH HERESY.

When the Church of all time forbade all heresy and schism, was she or was she not, acting rightly, and with justice and charity? It was a supreme law that ensured the safeguarding of her Faith: that every error, every attack upon dogma, morals, the liturgy or the Sacraments, upon the institutions of the Church, was followed up and suppressed, without any exception. The Faith was upheld by Law - the law of the Church and the law of the Catholic State.

You have turned order into a chaos where the Pope himself, and equally the lowest clerk in a newspaper office, are broadcasting their own new and wild theories. And the wilder they are, the more noble and apostolic they are said to be. It is only those who defend the Faith who are treated with suspicion and contempt. If this goes on, the Church will go to her ruin.

I could bring my Libellum to a conclusion here. There is enough written already to condemn you. For as you know, Most Holy Father, every true reform of the Church, "in capite et in membris" requires first that the Sovereign Pontiff should himself be above any suspicion in matters of Faith, and secondly, that he should not hesitate to strike at heresy wherever it is to be found, even at the highest levels of the Church.

Both these requirements affect you directly. For it is you yourself who are in the vanguard of all heresy today, it is you who spreads it or guarantees the indemnity of those who do so. How then can you still continue to be the Head of the Church - which is ever pure and above suspicion - of the Church which, with the help of Our Lady, shall crush underfoot all the heresies of the world?

(*) The reference is to an article in the Christmas 1971 issue of La Vie Catholique, discussed in CRC No 53, CCR (English Ed.) No 24.

SCHISM

Most Holy Father,

Schism is the gravest of sins, because it offends against charity. I could say, against love, but this word is vague and ambiguous, because it is also used to mean blind passion. We all know exactly the meaning of the word Charity, the third and most desirable of the theological virtues. It means the love of our Heavenly Father and of the One sent by Him, Our Saviour Jesus Christ; and of the holy Ghost who, proceeding from the Father and the Son, fills the hearts of the faithful. Therefore also of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, through which the work of the Blessed Trinity is continued in time, down to our own day, and of the members of this Church who are our brethren and finally of our neighbour, whoever he may be, including even our enemies, for whom we wish nothing but good, and above all the greatest good of all - the faith through which they can attain life everlasting...

Charity - which is Love, guided and regulated by Faith and Hope - necessarily carries with it the hatred of Satan, the Prince of God's enemies, and of the schisms and heresies which he has brought about in the past and still continues to provoke today. It must imply also a righteous hatred of the originators of heresies and schisms both ancient and modern, not indeed as far as their souls are concerned, but of their teaching and their evil intentions, of their actions directed against Christ. And finally, it must include an absolute hatred of all that is insulting to God and hinders the action of His grace: false religions and ideologies, books, parties, meetings calculated to interfere with the peace of the Church.

It is the love of the Light, with a commensurate hatred of Darkness, which results in that overflowing, apostolic love towards all men, which is prepared to undertake anything in order to snatch them from the hands of the Powers of Darkness and bring them back into union with the Mystical Body of Christ. It is in this sense that we are called, to use a term invented in his ardent love of Our Lord and of the most abandoned of heathens, by Father Charles of Jesus(*), to be "Universal Brothers".

SCHISM AS A THREEFOLD INVERSION OF LOVE.

Alas, Most Holy Father, you have shown, over these past ten years, such an inversion of love, that we are forced to charge you with schism, however paradoxical this may appear when applied to the person of the Pope who would be expected - in accordance with the inscription on the dome of Saint Peter's, to be the bond of charity: Inde oritur unitas sacerdotii. But alas, what should be the very source of unity now gives rise to division, chaos springs from the stronghold of Charity, and love has become so disordered that it embraces only what is evil and is changed to coldness or even hatred towards that which has remained good!

Schism with regard to individuals.

You seem always to be seeking the company of those who are "at a distance", and singling them out for signs of your love and respect, in preference to those of your own Faith. If this were done with the apostolic intention of bringing them back into the fold, as you sometimes say! But in fact this anomalous preference that you show towards them serves only to encourage them to remain where they are, in the false security resulting from your apparent approval.

Conversely, you manifest coldness and enmity towards the most affectionate and the most devoted of your children. It would seem that they are merely a source of irritation for you and that you expect nothing from them. We have reached the stage where it is easier to gain your favour if one first turns into an enemy of the Church, or at least mounts an attack upon the Papacy.

Schism with regard to the Church, her rites and Tradition.

This paradoxical love manifests itself not only with regard to individuals, but also with regard to all that constitutes the beauty and colour of the Church's everyday existence, her institutions and her liturgy, her Tradition in fact. You admire the language, ceremonial, and traditions of other religions. And the farther from us and the

(*) Father Charles de Foucauld.

more strange, the more offensive even to our Christian sensibility, they are, the better you like them. Conversely, you pursue with a destructive hatred all that pertains to the ancient Catholic tradition, to the Roman Church, the Roman liturgy and all the hallowed liturgies of the Western Church. And you will not desist until our customs and discipline have, together with our liturgy, been entirely replaced by those which are found in schismatic and heretical bodies. You hypnotise the Church into feeling ill at ease in her own skin and wishing to invest herself with some of those she despised in the past.

Schism with regard to God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Such a transfer of his affections from his own kind to his enemies, such a veritable denial of charity on the part of the Roman Pontiff which leads him to destroy the traditional rites and institutions of his own Church in order to replace them with ones that are alien to her, must be founded on - or else eventually lead to - a separation from God. A paradoxical inversion of love on such a scale, obstinate and lasting, and completely unyielding, could not take place without involving also the First Causes, the Personifications of Good and Evil, whence flows all the good and evil in this world here below.

You show yourself so indifferent towards the interests and the rights of God, so disdainful of the Will of God, so hostile towards what is beyond doubt the work of God, that it makes my blood run cold. The furtherance of God's cause among men and the welfare of the Church mean nothing to you, while you show a passionate, excited interest - which is even reflected on your face and gives it sometimes a youthful appearance - for the Kingdom of Satan, his pomps and his works..

Most Holy Father, I tremble with confusion and distress as I write such accusations. But I will pursue my task to its bitter end. You have, through many public acts, some with world-wide repercussions, set a hateful example of how not to love, to the members of your own Church, many too weak not to follow in your wake. Yet no one can serve two masters, no one can contain in his heart two contradictory, mutually exclusive kinds of love. And for the past ten years you have been doing all in your power, through words and actions, to help in the building of that Other City, of which St Augustine wrote, contrasting it with the Heavenly City: "Two kinds of love have built two cities: the Love of God which despises self, and the love of self, which despises God."

I shall leave to the chapter entitled Scandal my evidence that a love which is turned away from one's own brothers is a manifestation of love of self. Here I am concerned with showing that the love which you show "the others" has given rise within the Church to those terrible things, hatred and division, in other words, to Schism. The examples I will give are taken from a mass of others which I made no attempt to record. I had no intention of tracking down your every move, of spying upon you, and the idea of compiling a list of evidence against my own Father did not come to me till recently. What I have at hand is ample and indeed far too painful for me to wish to lengthen the list.

I - SCHISM SHOWN BY FEELINGS AND ATTITUDES.

There is a French proverb: "If you tell me who your friends are, I will tell you who you are." One could add: "And I will tell you whom you hate." In the case of the Pope, who is the Father, not of all men indiscriminately, but first and foremost of the Catholic faithful and of the rest only potentially, in the expectation of their conversion, one would imagine that his heart would be more open to the faithful than to unbelievers, to the members of the Church rather than to her enemies.

And as there have always been within the Church, both good wheat and cockles, those who uphold the Church's Tradition and the innovators, with opposition and fighting between the two sides, it would be expected that the Pope, though lending a ready ear to all his children without exception, would take care to show a just preference, a more marked favour towards the most orthodox and devoted and to signify his disapproval of, and his desire for the amendment of, the most extreme theologians and any revolutionaries or others who give scandal in any way.

As for you, ever since you committed yourself to the Reformation and indeed placed yourself at its head, with your Encyclical Ecclesiam Suam, you have been so ardent in your fight against what was traditional in the Church, its "routine and inertia", that you cannot disguise your illfeeling towards the traditionalist side who continue to defend what you are seeking to destroy, and who refuse to accept what you are seeking to impose.

Admittedly, you did not excommunicate those traditionalists who are for the most part scared and prepared to accept your directives, and capable of amazing efforts of will in order to combine in their hearts their loyalty to their convictions with that which they feel towards your Person. You could not very well excommunicate them, without any canonical indication (the affair of Action française is now a thing of the distant past!) and in any case you had made it clear that you had no intention of excommunicating anybody. But you have gone to the greatest lengths to avoid any direct, human contact with them. This is even worse than excommunication. It is the "dialectical suppression" of Hegel: to treat the enemy as simply non-existent.

We on the other hand continue to recognise your existence; we write to you and we go to see you. We pray for you, we tell you that we remain obedient in spite of our dismay - though we no longer understand much that is happening and are unable, in conscience, to accept many of the innovations - but we remain united to Your Holiness in loyalty of heart and will, and in our conduct. But you have not a word to say to us, neither of praise nor of blame, you refuse to pass judgment upon us, good or bad. You reject us entirely, refusing all dialogue with this the most long-suffering part of your flock who nevertheless are the most attached of all your children to Rome and to the Holy See. For we are not schismatics, as some of your courtiers try to claim or to forecast. We are not breaking any links. The "breaking-off of relations", which signifies schism comes entirely from your side, and for no reason except sectarian fanaticism and a liking for novelty. It is you who is the schismatic!

My personal disappointments.

I could write about my personal story, for that is what I know best. I have never broken away from you. I went to Rome in 1963, at the beginning of the troubles, and again in 1964. Much later, in 1967, I was bold enough to write you a long Open Letter on the Subject of Reform. But I never received so much as an acknowledgement. (*) When my Bishop sought to accuse me of schism and heresy, it was to your Tribunal that I addressed my appeal. "Caesarem appellasti? Ad Caesarem ibis", Cardinal Lefebvre said to me, not for the moment realising that the quotation was of the words spoken by Festus to St Paul! But the justice meted out by Nero to the Apostle was better than Your Holiness's towards me. The formula of recantation and submission, which had been passed by you before it was given to me to sign, was so outrageous and inhuman that only a bootlicker without faith or honour could have signed it. (**) I was treated by you like a slave. So I refused, but suggested an alternative formula, couched entirely in Catholic terms, respectful to your Authority and of the rights which you are empowered to exercise over my intelligence, my heart and my life, which must always safeguard in the first place the Rights of God, and respect the sacred rights of Truth and Charity. But you never responded to this suggestion which I made in all filial loyalty.

And it was with your consent that my name was dragged into the mud round the whole world as that of a rebel. (**) Such injustice and slander prove that it is you who have rejected me. But I will not reject you and in thus writing to you I give you proof of my continuing filial affection.

The insults suffered by the faithful.

Had it only been myself! But they all fare the same, the Catholic faithful who will not follow sheeplike all the changes, all the whims and fancies of their priests and who one day take up their pen trembling and write to you, telling in a few awkwardly chosen words the drama of their conscience... If you only realised with what respect, love and confidence they write their letter!

Oh well, if they receive any reply from Rome at all, then it reads as follows; it is always the same, so I know it by heart:

"The Secretariat of State is sorry to have to tell Mr X. that the terms of his recent letter are not calculated to contribute in any way to that edification of the Church in faith and charity which he seems to desire. It exhorts him to follow the directives of the bishops of France who, in communion with the Sovereign Pontiff, have the sole responsibility for the pastoral administration of their respective dioceses." That is all!

If the letter or the petition has been published or has otherwise attracted special attention and is judged to be in any way dangerous to the Party, then it is communicated to the local bishop, so that the latter may launch a counter-attack. For this purpose he is supplied with a letter from Rome, reading something as follows:

(*) The text of this Letter is printed in CRC Nos 1 - 2 (French Ed. only)

(**) CRC No 23. The relevant documents were reprinted in the CCR (English Ed.) No.25.

"Dear Monsignor,

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter (or petition, or telegram) recently received by the Holy Father....Perhaps you would inform the writer(s) in whatever manner seems to you appropriate that the Holy Father has noted their communication and invites them to follow the pastoral directives given by their Bishop in accordance with the instructions of the Holy See.

Yours, etc.

(Sgnd) J. Cardinal Villot"

So, instead of saying that we have no means of attracting your attention, it would be more correct to say that Your Holiness is not acting as the Arbiter between the two sides, but as one who has made it clear that he wishes to bring about - to use the ingenuous expression of Cardinal Garrone - "the defeat of the other side".(*)

The Rome Pilgrims.

Everybody heard of your refusal to grant an audience, or to greet in any way, those thousands of traditionalist Catholics who had come to entreat you to safeguard their right to the Old Roman Rite of the Mass. And, was it the following day? when you received the leaders of the anti-Portuguese rebellion, they were told that these were Christians and the Pope never refused to see anybody who had come to Rome for this purpose. This was such a flagrant lie that it was greeted with laughter. But the press the world over understood your refusal to grant the traditionalist pilgrims an audience as a mark of your august displeasure, and your warm reception of the West African terrorist leaders - responsible for massacres of women and children - as an encouragement of their anti-colonial aspirations.

When another group, from France, more blindly devoted to the Holy See, went to Rome to assure you of their loyalty, you did not, indeed, spurn them, because there is nothing to fear from that quarter, but you used the opportunity of their visit to admonish them:

"...We are aware that these pilgrims, who have come in such large numbers, are anxiously loyal to the Catholic Faith, to the Church, to the See of Peter. And so we are glad to invite them to join, together with their Catholic brothers and sisters, and in confident collaboration with their bishops, who have the responsibility for all pastoral matters, in the vast effort of Conciliar Renewal to which the whole Church is called."

I know some among those pilgrims whose eyes were opened as a result of this your declaration and who tore up their membership cards of Les Silencieux de l'Eglise then and there, and decided to join the Catholic Counter-Reformation instead. They had expected to find in you the Father of all, the Vicar of Christ, who would listen to them and pay heed to their lawful grievances. Instead, they found one who had firmly taken sides, and merely sent them back to the tender mercy of their Gallican despots.

Traditionalist movements made into a laughing stock!

I could give the example of the Catholic Traditionalist Movement in the USA, whose founder, the excellent Father Gommar de Pauw, sent you a most touching, pleading letter, dated 15th August 1967. There is no end to the saga of troubles with which he had to put up from that day onward. You did not vouchsafe him a reply, and it was in the knowledge of your backing that the US bishops have done nothing to spare such a reactionary Movement.

The Spanish Confraternity of Priests are brave fighters against subversion and we should have expected Your Holiness to welcome the news of their Congress for the Defence of the Mass and the Priesthood, held at Saragossa in September 1972, and to be pleased to send them your Apostolic Benediction. Instead, you wrecked their efforts in an entirely unworthy manner. When several Cardinals of the Curia, and a number of Archbishops and Bishops had already committed themselves to attending, and had even announced the theme of the talks they were to give, a last minute order coming from you stopped their attendance. None dared to risk your frown. And the progressive press the world over was delighted at the trick which you had played on these worthy and devout priests, who went on, in spite of everything, to express publicly their respect and obedience, their confident devotion to your Person. It really is enough to make one weep. On which side is the schism? Who is it that shows a burning love and charity? On which side lies the hatred?

(*) An interview given on 7th November 1969, quoted in Documentations Catholiques, 69, 1093.

The Seminary of St Pius X.

Mgr Marcel Lefebvre was one of the two or three among the "minority" at the Council whose head remained clear and whose courage did not fail. On that account alone he would have deserved a Cardinal's hat at your hands, even had it been only to show your continuing paternal feelings towards all your children or as a sign of clemency to the vanquished. Instead, he has been the constant victim of your silent but attentive wrath. You were glad to see his downfall, and saw to it that he should leave Rome. You allowed him to be ostracised by the French Episcopate.

His Seminary does not owe you anything, except that you were not able to inhibit its birth. But our bishops have all sworn never to accept any of its priests. For them this radiantly Catholic institution has become the "wildcat Seminary". Once again, we ask where the hatred lies. On which side is discord and the intention of schism, which side has offended against his brother? I know full well that, in agreement with Cardinal Villot and the French Episcopate, you are seeking to destroy this little seedbed of vocations, this refuge of true Christian freedom, this haven for priests after God's heart. Should you succeed in doing so, your schism will only become the more manifest.

Your relations with the world at large.

I could go on listing examples of your sectarianism. If I were to mention all the cases where you have shown friendships that are entirely against nature, and enmities without reasonable cause, there would be no end to the list, for the relations of the New Rome with the various religious, ethnic or national groups of the world follow such a pattern. India, for instance, has risen in your affections and has for you become more "peace-loving" (*) since she snatched Goa from Portugal. Spain has your sympathy only to the extent to which she moves in the direction of revolution. North Vietnam has all your sympathy against the South. I need not continue. The story is always the same. You are against the Catholics, and for their enemies. I shall have more to say later on about those who are suffering persecution, and find that you are favouring their persecutors...

But why? What causes this misplacement of your affections? The answer is that it is the result of your aberrant way of thinking. A heretic, even if he is allowed to remain within the bosom of the Church, cannot bear to live in peace and brotherly communion with those who live by that Faith which he no longer has, and against which he is fighting. He is necessarily sectarian, to the extent to which he is no longer a man of God but a man of a particular philosophy. Sooner or later, he begins to develop feelings such as Cain had for his brother Abel, as we read in Holy Scripture, and we know that he ended up by killing him. Psychologically, you have reached a similar stage, as we are made aware when we hear those strange-sounding curses which you shower upon those - mostly simple souls who have lost the ground from under their feet - who will not follow in your footsteps: "Woe to those who remain aloof, woe to those who are sad; to those who are indifferent and discontent, woe to those who lag behind!" (**)

II - SCHISM SHOWN BY ACTIONS: AGAINST THE CHURCH.

In order that your ideas may carry the day, the other side - the one that remains faithful to the Church's teaching, must be laid low. The success of your plan for a union of religions, or at least a spiritual union involving the whole world and acting as the Animator of the New City of men, requires a break with all that was Catholic in the narrow sense of the word. In thus breaking with the past, you give your feeling of schism a new and factual dimension.

The "reform" of the Liturgy, of Canon Law, in the pastoral field, was to have two results: in the first place, the traditionalist camp would find themselves in opposition with the Church. Without official standing, deprived of their means of expression, they would soon be reduced to a small hard core of last-ditchers. In this regard, you have been successful. The liturgical and pastoral changes have uprooted and disoriented the traditionalists, forcing them to retreat into a corner or get out altogether.

A second result was supposed to be the entry into the Church in vast numbers of those outside for whose benefit the new church buildings and the new liturgies had been provided. But the prophecy of St Pius X, spoken to a priest innovator who had urged him to modernise everything in the House of God, had come true: "When you have finished, my friend, you will find that those inside will leave, but those who are outside will remain there."

(*) Discourse given at Bombay, 4th December 1964

(**) Spoken on 14th September 1966, Documentation. Catholique 66, 1644

But you have never told us clearly - and this is perhaps the greatest of my complaints against you - that your reason for thus destroying the traditional Church and bringing in one crazy novelty after another is to open the Church to those who are and always will remain strangers to our Faith...

You have put slurs upon the Church's past, and taught your people to despise their heritage.

Thus afraid to give the real reason for the changes because it would have been too shocking, you were driven to decry the things of the Church, her traditions and ceremonial, her customs and morals, and above all, the unchangeable character of her Law. Thus you told us that the liturgical changes would make the faithful pass from darkness into light, from stupor and inertia to an intelligent and active participation in the Mysteries. Please forgive me if I quote a passage from the Letter which I addressed to you on 11th October 1967:

"Everybody remembers the words used by Your Holiness with reference to the introduction of the liturgical reforms: 'a new spiritual pedagogy'. The faithful are called upon to become 'living and active members of the Mystical Body, instead of unconscious, inert, passive members'. 'The new Liturgical Constitution,' you say, 'opens up extraordinary religious and spiritual horizons; a doctrinal depth and authenticity, a rational Christian logic, a purity and richness of the ritual and artistic elements, which conform to the needs of modern man.' This new wonder you compare and contrast with 'the mentality of established habits', according to which 'the ceremonies are often nothing but the performance of external actions, and religious practice demands nothing more than a passive and inattentive assistance.' (13th January 1965)

On listening to you, Most Holy Father, it would seem that we are witnessing the appearance of light out of the shadows of the darkness of the pre-Pauline Church! And for once, the self-satisfaction of the innovators is accompanied by open derision of their predecessors.

Then we have your Allocution of 12th July last (*): 'The Council has presented the Church with a great and difficult task - to re-establish the bridge between herself and the men of today...We are thus assuming that for the time being such a bridge does not exist or else that it is not in a satisfactory state, even if not completely destroyed. If we think of it, this implies a terrible and vast drama, on a historical, social, and spiritual scale. It means that, in the present state of things, the Church no longer knows how to present Christ to the world effectively and adequately.' "

I can hardly believe that my quotation of your words was correct, that you could have used such terms. So I look up the reference again: yes, you did say it. And so I will continue to quote from the Letter I wrote to you then:

" 'If we think of it, this implies a terrible and vast drama, on a historical, social, and spiritual scale': in other words, it means that the pre-Pauline Church 'had failed her divine mission, on a historical, spiritual, and social scale!'

If this 'Great upheaval' of the Conciliar Reformation was 'necessary, opportune and providential, an innovation which - We hope - is also a consolation' (your Discourse of 1st March 1965), this means that the Church's tradition which it is destroying from top to bottom, had lost its 'authenticity, depth, logic, purity, riches, efficacy, modernity' (your Discourse of 13th January 1965). The more the innovators exalt themselves, the more they correspondingly decry the Church of the past...Our generation accuses the Church of past centuries of sin, both in her teaching and her institutions, but even more in the very loyalty she has always shown in upholding all her traditions, in the face of all the Reformers and rebels." (**)

Let us leave it at that! I will only say that it is never the faults of the men of the Church, their slowness or laziness, their indifference, which you blame - for this has indeed always existed, and can and should be perpetually reformed. You blame the entire Tradition of the Church, in liturgical, canonical, and pastoral matters, and are ready to throw it all upon the rubbish heap, promising us instead a whole series of never-ending, breathtaking novelties.

You invoke the authority of the Council and the claim of the Church to obedience.

At times of particular difficulty - when the New Reformation showed too clearly its Protestant or humanistic countenance, when you were in the act of demolishing some of the things held sacred and unassailable by everybody (and I must admit, Most Holy Fa-

(*) I.e. July 1967

(**) Abbé de Nantes' Letter to the Holy Father. CRC Nos 1 and 2. (French Edition)

ther, that I myself did not fear for the Mass, holding it to be so stable and firmly established, so hallowed, that I believed it impossible that anyone could lay hands on it without the whole Church rising up in its defence) - at times of such difficulty, you have taken care to conceal your "ecumenical" intentions and have falsely appealed to the Council and to an obedience which we owe to it. As though you, the Pope, felt yourself bound by the Council. And especially when the Council in fact neither wanted nor believed possible what it had been tricked by you into endorsing. Thus, speaking about the New Mass:

"The change has something astonishing about it, something extraordinary. This is because the Mass is regarded as the traditional worship and the authenticity of our faith. And so we ask: how could such a change be made? The answer is: it is due to the will expressed by the Ecumenical Council held not long ago (and here you quote a text couched in such vague terms that the Fathers could not possibly have anticipated what abusive use you would make of it). The reform which is about to be brought into being is therefore (therefore!) a response to an authoritative mandate from the Church. It is an act of obedience... to which we must all give prompt assent..." (*)

A week later, in order to silence those who continued in their stubborn opposition, you went on: "Let us take a look at the motives for the introduction of such significant changes. The first is obedience to the Council. That obedience now implies obedience to the Bishops, who interpret the Council's prescriptions and put them into practice." (**)

Let us pay particular attention to the terms in which you continue: "The first reason is not simply canonical - relating to an external precept. It is connected with the charism of the liturgical act. In other words, it is linked with the power and efficacy of the Church's prayer, the most authoritative utterance of which comes from the Bishops. This is also true of priests who help the Bishop in his ministry, and, like him, act 'in persona Christi' (cf. St Ign. Ad Eph. 4). It is Christ's will, it is the breath of the Holy Spirit, which calls the Church to make this change. A prophetic moment is occurring in the mystical body of Christ, which is the Church. This moment is shaking the Church, arousing it, obliging it to renew the mysterious art of its prayer." (**)

No! A thousand times No! On hearing your involved reasoning the more credulous part of your audience would believe that the Church really had been asleep with the Old Mass, and that it was Christ in Person who had come to rouse His people and force them to change, through the means of the New Mass. But the theologian can see through the deliberate confusion which you introduce into your argument to give force to the blow which you strike against the Mass. For it is when we priests utter the sacred Words of Consecration, that we are acting in the name of Christ, and that is why our words are infallibly efficacious to produce the Eucharistic miracle. But you would extend this infallibility to the entire "liturgical action" and hence, included under this title, to the liturgical changes affecting the rite of the Mass. No! The Pope, the Bishop, the priest, is "another Christ" when he celebrates the Sacred Mysteries, but most certainly not when he is engaged in overthrowing them! This you must take back, Most Holy Father, unless you really wish to crown falsehood king in the Church!

This schism, this terrible break with all our liturgical tradition, has been perpetrated by you, over and above anybody else, and, in the slurs you have cast on the work of centuries, in your demand to accept in the name of obedience a set of changed rites which are calculated to modify also the Faith, you have taken risks with the very validity of the Sacraments. This is an act of schism, carried with the aid of deception!

THE AUTODEMOLITION OF THE CHURCH.

I could not even attempt to list all the cases of destruction combined with the installation of novelties which have taken place under your Pontificate. There are far too many, in every sphere. We find there are ten different rulings relating to one and the same decision. Sometimes the destruction has been carried out in stages. The changes are never definitive in the first place: often they are introduced on an experimental basis, or with reference to special cases. But they are always in the same direction, and nothing is safe from the vandals. They are always a step ahead of the regulations, but these always catch up with them, and then they can move on to the next stage. As Cardinal Gut admitted: "Many priests have been doing just what they please. They have taken the initiative without authorisation and often enough it has been im-

(*) Allocution given on Wednesday, 19th November 1969

(**) Allocution given on Wednesday, 26th November 1969.

possible to put a stop to it. It has gone too far for that. In his great wisdom and kindness of heart therefore, the Holy Father has given way, in many cases against his will." (*) Is it a sign of wisdom and kindness to allow a madman to destroy his heritage?

How are we expected to know what was in accordance with your wishes and in which cases you merely yielded, what is allowed and what is forbidden, what is from God and what is from the Devil? In every sphere, the general trend is towards the destruction of all that is hallowed by the centuries, to be replaced by a series of disorganised and unstable, purely human inventions which have not even been carefully thought out and do not have the makings of anything solid or universal.

The cassock began to be thrown aside already on the eve of the Council, but only under certain rigidly defined conditions. Today it is hardly seen anywhere, and our Bishops go about in collar and tie. Religious of both sexes follow the same trend, and are regarded as the more "apostolic" the more closely they follow the latest fashions. A mere detail, you might say? I consider this example to be a sign of capital importance. "Secularisation", "laification", "declergification", of the habit is either a sign of, or else it brings about a parallel change in the soul. Today we see how the priest's vestments are discarded one by one while the Mass is being changed into a fraternal repast. The one follows logically on the other.

You have suppressed the use of Latin, and consequently of Gregorian chant. This you did in direct opposition to a formal Encyclical of your immediate Predecessor, John XXIII, and in opposition even to the Council itself, as we have heard repeated over and over again. It is always easier to destroy than to rebuild, and most people are ready to follow what is easy, the more so when they are told to take this course by authority itself. It only needed one of your Wednesday Allocutions - the one of 26th November 1969: "The introduction of the vernacular will certainly be a great sacrifice for those who know the beauty, the power, and the expressive sacrality of Latin. We are parting with the speech of the Christian centuries; we are becoming like profane intruders in the literary preserve of sacred utterance.... We have reason, indeed, for regret, reason almost for bewilderment. What can we put in the place of that language of the angels? We are giving up something of priceless worth." And the reply you give is, to use your own words, "apparently very human and prosaic", but in your eyes it is nevertheless "sound and apostolic": "Understanding of prayer is worth more than the silken garments in which it is royally dressed"! And so you have broken with the tradition of the centuries by changing the language. From being mysterious, sacral, it has become, as you wished it to be "intelligible and profane". Supporting yourself, as you so often do, with a quotation from St Paul taken out of its context, you take a stand which is squarely opposed to that upheld by the Church throughout the ages, and you thus put her in the wrong and condemn her unchangeable law. Is that not schism?

Are we still concerning ourselves with mere details? I hold, together with the entire, unanimous Catholic Magisterium and against your solitary opposition, that to abandon the language implies or brings in its wake a disdain of the worship of God, allowing mere human chatter to take its place. That this is what has happened in our modern liturgical assemblies is, alas, too evident.

The form of administration of the Sacraments is being changed, bit by bit. The Exorcisms have been suppressed in Infant Baptism, because it is no longer "done" to believe in the presence of the Demon in an innocent child. I am deeply shocked at the changes made in the Sacrament of Confirmation, but do not feel competent to pass judgment on these. The new directives concerning Collective Absolution and the permissions granted, especially by the Canadian Episcopate, seem to me to imply that the essential conditions of the Sacrament would not normally be fulfilled, thus rendering such "confessions" invalid. The destruction of this Sacrament is an essential step in the Protestantisation of the Church. (**) This is evidently well under way!

Then we have the attempts being made "from the base" to modify the absolute character of the Sacrament of marriage. Here Rome has not (as yet) given way, but it is tolerating annulments decreed by diocesan authorities, motu proprio. Will Cardinal Staffa be allowed to have the last word on the subject, we wonder?

The whole hierarchy of Holy Orders has been muddled up as a result of your Decrees. The fact that the Order of Exorcists has been suppressed does not mean that the Devil, or those possessed by him no longer exist; but merely that efforts are no doubt be-

(*) In an interview given on 20th April 1969

(**) "New Norms" published on 16th June 1972

ing made towards dialogue and reconciliation with these old enemies who as a result of misunderstandings still remain at a distance from us! It seems that you regretted, in a moment of depression, what you had done in this sphere. But we are to have, instead, special "ministries" created for laymen - and women. This very morning we hear of a decision by Rome authorising them to distribute Holy Communion. Abolish all the differences, all the hierarchical grades, all the ancient dividing lines intended to remind men (and women) that there is no Priesthood except the sacramental...and you will end up by having no priests!

I will make only passing mention of Extreme Unction which has become a plea for, a help towards the preservation of the all-important earthly life and health, because modern man does not want to die, and cannot bear hearing about the Judgement of God or Life everlasting, even when the aim is to prepare him sacramentally for it.

And finally, you laid hands upon the Mass. There was not one change, but a hundred. However, on looking back over the history of this "reform" of the Mass, we can distinguish three main phases.

First there is the desacralisation of Holy Communion by various means. Received standing, later in the hand, then distributed by lay people, finally by girls, or even on occasions - as for instance at your own celebration in Geneva - passed in a vulgar manner from hand to irreverent, dirty hand in the crowd. (*) Then we have celebrations round a dining table, or in picnic fashion. Catholics must have a very firm faith indeed in the Eucharist if it is to withstand such vulgarisation.

Then your "reform" attacked the Propitiatory Sacrifice itself. Herein lies the schismatic element of your New Ordo, exemplified in its Article 7, which you neither regretted, nor rescinded: "The Lord's Supper or Mass is the sacred synaxis or assembly of people united under the presidency of the priest, in order to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. That is why there applies in a particular manner to such a local assembly of Holy Church the promise of Christ: where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them (Mt. 18,20)" This is your Ordo Missae. You did not write the definition yourself: you are not so heretical as all that. But you accepted it and when you were obliged to rectify it you did so without admitting that it had included an expression of that error with which indeed this whole artificial liturgy is tainted.

Much has been written about the consequences of this: how priests have, as a result of the new thinking reflected in this liturgy, lost their Catholic belief in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. My own enquiries show that there are very great numbers indeed of priests who ascribe to the "Eucharistic Celebration" no significance other than that of a memorial of the Last Supper, that is to say, of the fraternal repast which Jesus took with His Apostles on the evening of Maundy Thursday. Indeed the words which you yourself used, at that critical moment when your Reform had to be pushed through quickly at whatever cost, gave it a slant in this direction, though your terms were so carefully chosen that they remained within the bounds of orthodoxy:

"The Mass is and remains the memorial of Christ's Last Supper." (**) This as it stands is definite heresy and it is this phrase which passed from your mouth into the hearts of thousands of priests, and corrupted their faith. But you had been careful to incorporate this definitive error into a theory - little known and rather unusual - emanating from Father de la Taille, according to which the Supper and the Cross form a single liturgical act, a single Sacrifice. Thus you safeguarded yourself and were able for all practical purposes to adopt a Protestant viewpoint without formally abandoning Catholic doctrine. It was very cleverly done! But your priests can see through it, Most Holy Father, and they understand well enough that your intention in devising the New Ordo was to bring us closer to Protestantism, an example which they are not slow to follow.

The third phase of the famous "changes" affects the priesthood itself, downgrading it and changing its meaning. The so-called common priesthood takes over from the priest, so that the People of God seem to share also in his function of Consecrating, leaving him as the mere President, spokesman, delegate, leader of the team. The Catholic priesthood must rest on very solid foundations indeed to have resisted to the extent it has, the numerous manoeuvres and concerted attacks which you have admittedly lamented, but without showing any genuine desire to assure the triumph of orthodoxy - a fact that has been clear to me since the 1971 Synod of Bishops. (***)

(*) A photograph of this (afterwards widely reproduced) appeared in Spectacle du Monde, July 1969.

(**) Allocation of 19th November 1969.

(***) Discussed in CRC No 51 and 48 (CCR 22 and 19)

THE SIGN OF SCHISM.

I discussed this at length in connection with the Bishop of Nancy's attempt to forbid the celebration of the Old Roman Rite (*). Whereas one might still tolerate the introduction of a new liturgy, to forbid the Old is evidence of an absolute desire for change, founded on hatred of Tradition. And because the new rite is ambiguous, Catholic and Calvinist at the same time, it is clear that to forbid the rite which is Catholic beyond any shadow of doubt is to break with Catholic Tradition for the sake of adopting one that is Protestant.

Well, I have just read a statement by Mgr Adam, Bishop of Sion, forbidding the celebration of the Mass known as the Mass of St Pius V, except by special indult, and basing this upon the express and personal wish of the Holy Father (**). I think I can see this wish directed like a poisoned arrow against the Seminary at Ecône, into which it would thus seek to introduce qualms and internal dissensions, leading to its ruin. Be that as it may, the fact remains that we have been told it is your wish to see the Mass of St Pius V disappear entirely. As a prohibition it need however not worry us, for, being based on an abuse of power, it must surely be null and void.

But what is the meaning of all this? Your Encyclical Mysterium Fidei and your Credo would, so one would think, have been enough to clear you of any suspicion of heresy in regard to the dogma concerning the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. So why this passion for change, including change that opens the door of the Church to heresy? The only possible explanation lies in your desire for union with the Protestant bodies. It is the idea of Ecumenism which underlies the replacement of the Mass of all ages, known as the Mass of St Pius V, by the Mass of Paul VI. You had never told us this, but our eyes were opened when we saw on the cover page of Documentation Catholique for 3rd May 1970 the "six non-Catholic observers who had taken part in the latest meeting of the Concilium for the Liturgy". Their faces are covered with broad grins: they have every reason to be pleased! And there you are next to them with a sad smile; it makes me think that you had sold your right of First-born for a dish of lentils. You had broken with the Tradition of the Church in order to engage her along a new track of schism and heresy. What a pity!

III - SCHISM SHOWN IN CONTEMPT OF GOD.

The reason, Most Holy Father, why you meet with so little opposition - for our own is infinitesimal - is that people fail to understand you. Cardinals and Bishops, priests and faithful, however progressive they may be, have too preconceived an idea of the Pope to be able to listen to you with an open mind, to study you and see you as you would wish to be seen. They have an ingrained conviction that the Pope, the "servant of the servants of God", is concerned solely with safeguarding the unity of the Catholic Faith, the validity of the Sacraments, the Church's order and well-being, and her image. That is good enough for them. The Pope fears God, loves Our Lord Jesus Christ, listens to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, isn't that enough? How on earth could they understand what you are trying to do? And so you can follow your Great Design without disturbance or interference.

BUT YOUR GREAT DESIGN COMES INTO CONFLICT WITH GOD'S DESIGN.

You are the first Pope to decide not to let himself be restricted by the charge he has as Head of the Church, but to aim rather at the service, on a much vaster scale, of the whole of mankind. You believe that you are called by Providence, at this solemn moment of history, to establish peace on earth through the reconciliation of the diverse faiths in one great Union of all Religions. In your dream you will be the one to bring about the federation of all peoples - for the greater glory of Jesus Christ, of course. Your great ambition is to serve man.

It is certainly not your explicit intention to sacrifice the Church, her faithful, her Tradition and her institutions, in order to make your Great Design come true. You imagine rather, as part of your dream, that the Church will, in accordance with her greater vitality, assume the leadership of this union of religions... So it is not your direct intention to lead her to her ruin; if that were to happen it would only be an indirect, lamented consequence.

But even though you may be unaware of it, your design involves such a degree of indifference to God's own Church that it must necessarily entail also a total indifference towards Him who is her Founder and Sanctifier, her Master and Spouse. It is on this point, as I am about to show, that your schism has reached its culmination, that

(*) Lecture given by Abbé de Nantes at Nancy, June 1970. CRC No 33, CCR No 5. (the lecture is available in English as an off-print: Forbidding the Holy Roman Mass.)

(**) Documentation Catholique 73, 243.

of separation from God.

The various hypotheses put forward by theologians concerning the case of the "schismatic Pope" are outdated and inapplicable so far as you are concerned. They envisage a Pope who neglected his ecclesiastical affairs in order to occupy himself entirely with temporal matters, in the manner of Julius II, who engaged in worldly politics and waging wars, to such an extent that he could be said not to be governing the Church any more. That would be schism because the "unity of direction" was broken. With the Chief Shepherd occupied elsewhere, showing no concern for his flock, the sheep would be scattered. Your case is quite different. You have often stated, admittedly, that you have no material interests or temporal ambitions to pursue, and you like reminding people that your being a Head of State is a mere formality. And indeed, we are dealing here with something far more serious. For this Great Design of yours, which I have named the M.A.S.D.U. - the formation of a vast Movement for the Spiritual Animation of World Democracy, does represent for you a political interest, Utopian though it be, and a temporal ambition which, being on a planetary scale, is disproportionately greater than the mere local ambitions considered in the hypotheses. But the new, unheard-of element in all this is that your global project includes the Church as one of its constituent elements. Merely to show a lack of interest in the Church would be schism on a relatively minor scale. You seek rather to subject the Church to the World, whose Prince of Peace it is your ambition to become. In the words of St Paul, "you discern not the Body of the Lord."

For the major implication of your Great Design, which makes it schismatic in the highest degree, is that you no longer distinguish the Church from that which is not the Church, the Priesthood from that which is only its imitation, and the Mass from what is only a parody of it. In this you show a disdain of God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

YOU DISCERN NOT THE CHURCH FOUNDED BY GOD.

If there is One Church, it means there are not two. The concept of the One Holy Catholic Church excludes by its very nature the existence of any other Church. That is an article of our God-given Faith, and that is why we are inseparably bound to this One Church which is the great and universal "Design of God" in this world and in time, the only human organisation which, in a mysterious but visible manner, is the Mystical Body of Christ. The rest is schism or heresy, vain human inventions which do not find favour with God.

But in your Great Design, aspiring to be so much vaster than God's Design, though it is only a human project, you make no essential, absolute distinction between this One Church and the rest, the other religious bodies self-styled "Churches". This title which your Predecessors had always jealously reserved for the One True Spouse of Christ, you have been the first to apply indiscriminately to the various schismatic or heretical religious bodies: "O Churches, who are so far away and yet so close to Us! O Churches, the object of Our heartfelt desire! O Churches of Our incessant longing! O Churches of Our tears, etc." (*) And to increase even more this impression of equivalence between the true and the false, you have repeatedly proclaimed, in the interests of reconciliation and the restoration of a (lost!) unity, requests for pardon of the offences committed against each other. By thus reducing it to a merely human level, you simply cease to take account of the life of grace and holiness which belongs to the true Church alone, and place this side by side with various undifferentiated sociological groupings.

Your constant propaganda for ecumenism, even if it avoids any expressions which are clearly contrary to the Catholic Faith, in order to escape criticism, must necessarily lead to the various other Christian communities coming to be looked upon as true communities of salvation. Are you not showing clear contempt for the Will of God?

Among the hundred and one different acts which manifest your indifference towards the True Religion, the most significant was certainly your visit to the World Council of Churches, on 10th June 1969. How could you, Most Holy Father, as the guest of those 264 religious bodies who all consider themselves and each other as equals, do other than adopt the outlook and ideas, the ambient expressions, of the rest, even to the extent of making yourself a party to their schism, by speaking of "the Christian brotherhood between the member Churches of the W.C.C. and the Catholic Church." What "brotherhood" can there be between the Church and dissident bodies? In answer to the question - which you raised yourself - whether "the Catholic church should become a member of the Ecumenical Council", you came out, not with an absolute and uncondition-

(*) Opening Discourse of the Second Session of the Council, 14th September 1964

al No, but with an indecisive "Not yet" that seemed intended to prepare us for just that possibility: "In all brotherly frankness, we do not consider the question of the Catholic Church's participation in the Ecumenical Council to have advanced to the stage where one could give an affirmative answer. The question must as yet remain in the realm of hypothesis...certain grave implications...the way is long and difficult." In other words, the answer in the long term is Yes.

"The spirit of a sound ecumenism...which inspires all of us...requires, as a basic condition of all fruitful contact between different denominations, that each should loyally profess his own faith. It asks us to recognise, with no less loyalty, the positive, Christian, evangelical values which are to be found in the other denominations. It remains open to every possibility of cooperation...for example in the sphere of charity and in the search for peace between the peoples... This is the spirit which inspires Us as we come to meet you."

To the question whether it is possible to be saved in and through the means of one or other of these 264 member "Churches" of the W.C.C., you would certainly reply in the affirmative. Whereas the Catholic Church replies in the negative. And it shows how widespread your schismatic thinking has become, as a result of your own efforts in this direction, that most of those who will be reading these lines would hold you to be right, and me, wrong. You have taught Catholics to see no difference between the Mystical Body of Christ and the work of Satan.

Nor do you stop short at "Christians". The picture is always the same: you are glad to receive Jews, Moslems, Bonzes, or to go and visit them; in the course of your apostolic journeys you always desire to meet delegations representing all the various religions...Moreover, be it to maintain a worldly politeness, or a spirit of friendly, purely human dialogue, or out of a natural sympathy, you say things which, taken literally, are calculated praises of error and direct insults to the Truth, and therefore to God Himself!

How much we had to suffer on the occasion of your visit to Uganda does not bear thinking about! You went there to venerate the Catholic Martyrs and you finished by hopelessly mixing them up with Moslems and Protestants of whom we have no right to claim that they died for love of God or in the love of God. Worst of all, you saw all of them as martyrs for freedom of conscience. Like the heretics in the Middle Ages?

"Your martyrs, all the Christians gave their lives for their faith, in other words, for religion and freedom of conscience..."(*)

"Catholics as well as faithful of other denominations shed their blood upon this soil, in the name of God, with such happy results that today the national community of Uganda includes several different faiths, each of which respects and esteems the others."(**)

To ascribe to the "martyrs" - Moslem, Protestant, as well as Catholic, an "ecumenical spirit" is a violent anachronism, to say the very least. You did it as part of an appeal to the whole Black world to look forward to a future in which they should have forgotten their dogmatic quarrels...And you paid homage even to the Islamic religion: "Addressing the representatives of the Moslem community, Paul VI expressed his greetings, through them, to the whole Moslem population of Africa, assuring them of "his great respect for the faith which they profess and of his wishes that that which we all have in common may serve to bring Christians and Moslems closer together in a genuine brotherhood."(***)

Then there was your visit to Bombay...On that occasion you were presented by the HIndoos with a little idol and I was the only one to voice any protest! Your trip to Asia some years later showed us many examples of your indifference, your deliberate lack of discernment with regard to the various religions. Either you consider them to be all of divine origin, though perhaps to different degrees, or else they form for you the thousand facets of the "Phenomenon of Man". God's own Church is unique only in a subjective sense. The Osservatore Romano let a remark slip out when, on the occasion of your having given the standard of Lepanto back to the Turks, it was seeking to pacify the feeling that this act was likely to rouse: it assured us that, though you were offering dialogue to all who believe in God, you nevertheless remained "convinced that there is only one true religion, that is to say, Christianity." If that is so, your conviction remains a theoretical one, which you betray in your words and deeds.

(*) Discourse given on 6th August 1969.

(**) Report in Figaro, 7th August 1969.

(***) Reports in various papers on 4th August 1969.

YOU DISCERN NOT THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD.

If the distinction between the "Churches", the various religions, is not an absolute one, between the divinely ordained on the one hand and the merely human, or even diabolical, on the other, then there will be no absolute distinction between their priesthods either! For us there is only one Priesthood, that of our One High Priest, Jesus Christ and, through a sharing in His priestly Unction, that of the Catholic Priesthood. Apart from this, there can be no true priests. The schismatics have a valid priesthood only because it is derived through the same Apostolic Succession.

And in a matter of such supreme importance, you obscure the distinction, treating Protestant "pastors" as though they were true Catholic priests. You presented a challenge to Pastor Schutz; what did you intend him to use it for? For the celebration of his "Holy Supper" which is but a phantom? Or for the Mass which he has not the power to celebrate? You received Mr Ramsey as a priest, or rather as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England, successor of the glorious martyr Thomas Becket! You presented him with a pastoral ring and we heard that you invited him to bless the crowd on the occasion of that strange gathering at St Paul-outside-the-Walls. And everything seems prepared for the abrogation of the irreformable decisions of Leo XIII declaring Anglican Orders null and void.

And so, a mist begins to descend from above upon the priesthood, so that we are no longer clear about who is and who is not a priest. Our young folk are encouraged to visit Taizé where they take part in Protestant worship. So why should we not look upon Schutz, Thurian and those other gentlemen who are often received by the Pope, wearing their white albs, as genuine ministers of Christ? While you are doing what you can to upgrade and rehabilitate them, you allow the Catholic priesthood to be devalued. The priest is coming to be looked upon as increasingly similar to laymen, with their so-called "common priesthood", and his status as apostle of the Gospel is coming to overshadow that incomparable power which is his alone: that of celebrating the Sacred Mysteries.

At the Closing of the Synod of 1971, when the reaction which was taking place among the members of that Assembly might have saved the Catholic Priesthood, it was your own intervention which turned the scales, as though that were your intention. In your Discourse of 6th November, you spoke of "the priestly mission, common to priests and bishops: this is to proclaim Christ to the men of our day". (According to the report given in *La Croix*). The full text, though more involved, still does not say any more than that: the only thing which you mention specifically as pertaining to the "priestly ministry" is "the preaching of the Gospel". In that case all Christians are priests, and Protestant ministers just as much as we. For it is the task of every Christian to proclaim the Gospel.

I am not even astonished to hear that you let your theologians talk about the likelihood, in the near future, of "mutual re-ordinations" of priests and Protestant ministers, by reciprocal laying on of hands. So the priest, who has been truly ordained (at least, I hope so!), is to undergo this comedy of having the Pastor lay his hands upon him, on the pretence of infusing the Holy Spirit? A dry formality, for the sake of symmetry! And the Pastor, who - and this I know for certain - has not been truly ordained, is to be ordained "anew" and receive a priesthood in which as a Protestant he does not believe?

Those who can even dream of such things, and he, no less, who lets them proceed in such a perverse direction, do not "discern the Holy Spirit" where He is present, and do not distinguish His presence in the Church's Sacrament from the illusion of such a presence in heresy. This is the ultimate degree of contempt which you have reached in your deliberate indifference, for the sake of flattering men.

YOU DISCERN NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST.

But let us come to the most serious matter of all, one that is sacrilegious beyond any shadow of doubt. On 21st September 1966, at Assisi, Miss Barbarina Olson, a Presbyterian, received Holy Communion at her Nuptial Mass, without abjuration or Confession, and through your authorisation. It was published in the papers. The Holy Office, desiring to shield you from blame - and acknowledging thereby that the act was blame-worthy - told me in confidence that it was not Your Holiness, but another, who had given the authorisation. But that is absolutely useless, for the world believed and still believes that it had come from you, from the Pope. And ever since then, people believe that it is all right for Protestants to receive Holy Communion at Mass, provided this is specially authorised. When it began to be widely practised in Holland, you did not take any sanctions; however, that was Holland, after all! At a meeting of the W.C.C. at Uppsala, 7th - 9th July 1968, two Catholic observers took it upon themselves to partake of "communion" at a Protestant service, and hardly any criticism was

levelled against them. Next, on 6th September 1968, we have Cardinal Samore - who was only following in your footsteps - authorising the Protestant "observers" at Medellin to receive Holy Communion at the Mass which closed the Congress. The "observers" concerned were Brother Giscard, of Taizé, the Anglican Bishop Benson, Pastor Bahman - a Lutheran - and Pastors Kurtis and Sana, of the National Council of the Churches of Christ... And what was your reaction? To deplore, among other "recent events", certain "acts of inter-communion contrary to the lines of a just ecumenism". I repeat, "contrary to the lines of a just ecumenism" - that is to say, as something inopportune, or strategically unsound, when the events in question are offences against Divine Law! Moreover, some two months later, you appointed Cardinal Samore, who had been responsible for the "offence", Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, thus showing that you did not take a very serious view of his inopportune act!

I wrote at the time: "The offence itself would seem to increase the offender's standing in the very sphere in which the act was committed. In other words, where all have agreed to fail even in their most sacred duties, they can all claim justification in their fellows' support."

After that, things began to move quickly. Cardinal Bea gave a general authorisation of "open Communions" for certain cases (*) and when people had become used to the idea, his successor Cardinal Willebrands empowered bishops to authorise Protestants to receive Communion at a Catholic Mass. This was done by way of a highly official Decree which could not have been promulgated without your agreement. (**) Almost immediately, the Bishop of Strasbourg extends this authorisation - and why on earth shouldn't he, if it is a good thing? - and also allows the converse, the partaking of communion at the Protestant Supper by Catholics. We understand from the Strasbourg papers that you congratulated him on this.

I told them at the Holy Office, and I shall go on saying it whatever happens, that no one in the world, Bishop or Cardinal, Angel or even the Pope himself, has any right whatever to give the Sacrament of the Living to those who are spiritually dead. Yes, I know, a subjectivist like yourself would immediately ask by what right we can judge the Protestants and declare them to be "dead"? To which I shall reply by reminding Your Holiness that every individual who is not a member of the Holy Catholic Church is formally regarded as not living, and we have no right to decide, because he is a nice person or we like the look of him, that he is "saved", "living", "in a state of grace", as long as he remains outside the Church. This is one of those fundamental truths which ten years of your schismatic rule has as good as destroyed in the Church.

I have every right to say that no authority on earth has the right to admit to our Eucharistic "communion" those who are not - not as yet - members of the Catholic "communion". As the first Pope in history to have allowed and vulgarised this, are you not guilty of dissidence, of effecting a break with the "unity of direction", in other words, of schism?

Let me make one last and very serious point concerning your indifference to things divine. You must be fully aware that there are being "celebrated", in your Church and consequent upon your Reform of the Mass, a good number of sacrilegious "Eucharists" which through defect of matter or form are invalid beyond any possible doubt. There was for instance the one at Montargis (on 21st February 1971) which Mgr Riobé, Bishop of Orleans graced by his presence, thus giving it an appearance of respectability. But in the present dogmatic, liturgical and moral chaos which surrounds the practice of the Sacraments, there are many cases where the faithful no longer have any idea whether or not they are receiving the Sacraments, whether or not they are assisting at valid Masses or at invalid ghost performances or at Masses which are sacrilegious though valid. And they are very worried indeed.

Priests and theologians are divided into validists and invalidists. Rightly or wrongly, I have been firmly on the side of validity, placing my trust in the supreme part played by Christ and the Church. Others, more rigorous, favour invalidity and stress the need of an inward intention on the part of the minister of the Sacrament. The upshot of this state of affairs is that in many cases some of those present believe that a Sacrifice is taking place and pay homage to the Body and Blood of Christ, while the others believe that what is going on is but a hollow imitation, and so they refuse to adore mere bread and wine. This is an appalling, terrible situation!

How are we to "discern the Body of the Lord" when the very validity is in doubt, when the intention of the minister is shrouded in mist? I am convinced that the fault

(*) Documentation Catholique, 68, 1300.

(**) "Cases of Admission", 7th July 1972.

of the priest in such cases must be laid on the shoulders of the bishop, one of whose primary duties is to safeguard the validity of the Sacraments. And when all the bishops of the world persistently refuse to respond to the anguish of the faithful, then the responsibility for this collective offence of the entire Church rests on the Pope himself.

We are like children when their father brings home a woman and tells them to kiss her, leaving them in ignorance whether she is their mother or their father's mistress! When there is uncertainty, within the very Church of Christ, concerning the presence of God's grace, the Body and Blood of Our Lord, or the Unction of the Holy Spirit - and the Pope shows no concern to put things right and restore the safety and certainty of the Sacraments - then, Most Holy Father, we can no longer be in any doubt that his indifference to God has reached a stage when he no longer cares about incurring His everlasting wrath.

Your Great Design forms a barrier between yourself and the faithful of the Church, effective in proportion to the extent of their attachment to her Truth and Charity, and to her Tradition. It has led you to abandon all that which is specifically Catholic. And finally, it causes you to consider the things pertaining to religion from a purely human angle, making no distinction between those which, forming part of the true Church, are divine, and those which are merely human or even diabolical. How can you be so totally regardless of God?

Were a Pope to refuse entirely to perform his duties as Bishop of Rome, as Head of the Church, as Vicar of Jesus Christ, in order to devote himself wholly to worldly politics then, according to the teaching of Suarez, he would have to be proclaimed to be in schism and, on this account, considered to be deposed. So what are we to think of a Pope who goes one step further, and actually devotes himself to the creation of a community of salvation other than the Church, of a Universal Religion, of a "Movement for the Spiritual Animation of Modern Democracy"? There can be no doubt that we must in such a case too look upon him as schismatic, and do whatever lies within our power to rid the Church of him.

For he has already condemned himself who does not discern the Body of Christ from ordinary bread, or the Priesthood of Christ from that of the rest of men, or the Mystical Body of Christ - the Church - from a religion invented by men or even by the Devil himself.

SCANDAL

There can be no question here of criticising in any way the purely private life of the Sovereign Pontiff. That is a matter solely for God and his own conscience. To this there could only be one exception, the imaginary case of a Pope who, following certain scandals in his private life, was being blackmailed to the extent of being inhibited in the free exercise of his function. In such a case, the consequences of purely private offences would indeed be of concern to the whole Church, and it would be the duty of anyone having knowledge of such a state of affairs to do all within his power - even at the pain of incurring excommunication - to obtain the resignation of such a Pope.

It is with an entirely different sort of scandal that we are concerned here - with public acts of the Pontiff calculated to set a bad example to the faithful or in other ways to make the practice of their religion difficult for them... Your Pontificate, Most Holy Father, has been marked since 1964 by an unending succession of decisions and gestures intended to appeal to public opinion; many of them left us entirely in the dark regarding your motives, or else the explanation which you proffered at the time, though apparently adequate, turned out later to have been misleading, when the real - and often unexpected - motive was allowed to come to light. Often the intention became clear only when the enemies of the Faith showed us how delighted they were. Gradually, through an endless succession of novelties, some dramatic and unexpected, some of apparently little immediate significance, the people are being reduced to a state of bewilderment. They no longer have any idea whither they are being led.

The scandal of a sinful private life is a relatively slight one compared with that caused on a much larger, worldwide, scale, by certain "acts of the Pontiff" - liable to be interpreted as "Pontifical Acts" - which can hardly be viewed in a good light, even with the greatest effort of mental gymnastics. For it would seem that the Pope is going out of his way to shock, challenging his subjects to follow him in his extraordinary ways. Everything possible is done to discourage opposition, which proves difficult even to formulate when the intentions underlying the acts are so well disguised. Yet all who do not offer active opposition find themselves becoming accomplices before they know where they are.

Once we have grasped the concept of this Great Design which you are following, methodically and without hesitation, the reasons underlying the series of scandals which we are about to list - however incompletely - become easy to fathom. They represent a succession of acts undertaken on your own initiative and with the aim of bringing turmoil into a static situation - rather like breaking up the ice on a frozen expanse of water by a succession of carefully timed blasts. Apparently unexpected, they are not a series of chance acts, but part of a methodical plan whose excellent marksmanship fills us with admiration! This is Heresy in Action, Schism in the making, proceeding to the creation of a new, humanistic, "universal" Christianity. But we cannot help seeing it as the ruin of the Church and of Christian civilisation and their replacement by a Utopia in whose shadow is advancing the Kingdom of Satan.

THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION IS BEING DRIVEN TO HER RUIN.

We have seen a whole series of surprising decisions which were apparently aimed to show - or at any rate they caused people to believe - that the Church as an Institution had no claim to respect, apart from the men who represented it, and that the Pope was therefore free to make what changes he pleased, even in those matters which we had been been simpleminded enough to look upon as unassailable, changes affecting minor details but also points of fundamental importance. But always, there was this element of surprise and mystery surrounding the change...

You have given up the Tiara. This, the earliest of your "prophetic gestures", dates from November 1964. As I had already, since reading Ecclesiam Suam, seen through your intentions, I was able to understand the real meaning of this gesture without difficulty, as did also IDOC, whose function was to help Communism in its penetration of the Church, and who from that moment realised just where you stood politically.

But why did you have to hide your real intention under that romantic gesture of making a gift to the poor, inviting the Bishops to do likewise? For two reasons. Firstly, because you could not very well announce publicly, so soon after your accession, that the Roman Pontiff was giving up his right of precedence over Kings and Princes, which

is what the Tiara symbolises. That would certainly have given rise to suspicions and protests. And therefore, you chose to speak through a riddle. But the Freemasons understood without difficulty, while the Traditionalists, determined to maintain their trust in you, preferred not to understand... In order to show my friends what was going on, I foretold them on that very day that you would never have another Tiara made. At least you must admit that I am no fool, for I at least, did understand.

While not an outright lie, this is nevertheless a dissimulation - or, if you like, a parable. Did not Our Lord speak to the multitudes in parables, because a lesson thus taught, whose meaning is not immediately obvious, sinks in better in the end? And so, when you invited the bishops to follow your example and divest themselves for the sake of the poor, they did so, in considerable numbers, in accordance with your unspoken intentions. They laid down their episcopal insignia, the sign of their spiritual glory, and together with these, they renounced also the exercise of their authority, and they sold the treasures of the Church's heritage - but they left their bank accounts untouched. And even you, yourself, have you not had your apartments renovated and were you not going to build, at considerable expense, hanging gardens on the roofs of your palace, at the risk of causing damage to the old building?

I have written at such length about this, the earliest of these gestures, because it helps to explain other, similar, scandals. Over and over again, we note in your acts the same subtlety, which makes them so much more effective.

So you began to wear a Mitre in place of the Tiara, and soon after, gave up also your Shepherd's Crook. Our bishops understood that they too were to give up wielding the Crook, both literally and figuratively. You began to carry a Crucifix in place of the Crook, whereas your Predecessors had that carried in front of them, so that they might have it before their eyes. This new and unwonted custom suggests that you are renouncing your task of directing, governing, punishing your subjects. You seek to popularise a new image of the Pope - that of the humble Minister of the Word, who preaches the Gospel. The figure of Christ on the Crucifix you carry is terrible to behold, a skinned corpse, a picture of despair eliciting only despair in the onlooker, with no sign of His Divinity or His Glory to come, nor of His present Triumph. Here I am afraid to probe too deeply into your secret... But there must be a connection between the sorry figure on the Crucifix and some words spoken by you on 7th December 1965. Perhaps you look upon Christ as a symbol of the sum-total of human suffering?

On certain occasions you have been seen wearing in place of the Pastoral Cross, or in addition to it, an emblem better known to Jews than to Christians - especially if it happens to be a present from them: a jewel reproducing exactly the Ephod of the High Priest. A similar object has for a long time decorated the clasp of the pontifical cope. In this case, it symbolised that the Church, as the heir to the Old Covenant, replaced the latter, which ceased to exist from the moment of her birth, and acquired the right to whatever she chose of the old rituals and ornaments. She thus made use of this, the most mysterious of the old symbolic emblems, for decorating her vestments. But to wear it over your heart, together with the Cross, or even in its place, is an entirely different matter. And to adopt it at the very moment when the international Jewish organisations are exercising an increasing influence at the Vatican can only be a sign - clear if unspoken - of goodwill and cooperation. I said so at the time, full of indignation (*). If the object has not made its appearance since, so much the better!

In your generosity you made a present of your Crook and your Ring to the Burmese Buddhist, U Thant, in order to help the poor. Was this not calculated to give offence to any number of missionaries and sisters of Charity? Are there not poor in your own diocese who could do with help? We understand that these objects, after being sold and re-sold, have ended up in Geneva. (**) Why did you choose your Crook and Ring for this purpose? Because you wanted to give up the Crook, and the Pastoral Ring was of the old type. You were planning to give all the bishops of the world - at considerable expense - a new and different gold ring, which was to be the Ring of the Council. The change of Covenant was to be symbolised by a change of ring! The old rings had symbolised your Covenant with Rome and the Bishops' Covenant with the Church in their own diocese. So it was time to get rid of them, to sell one and to place another on the finger of Dr Ramsey(***). The new ring would symbolise their solidarity with the New

(*) CRC 37, CCR 9.

(**) The Voice (USA), 9th Dec. 1972

(***) 23rd March 1966. Documentation Catholique No 66 1469, cover photograph.

Church and with yourself - it would be the Ring of the Covenant of the Reformation... No, this is not a series of random acts: there is method in your madness.

Then there is a whole series of unexpected, enigmatic decisions involving individual persons and their functions, which constitutes already the greatest revolution ever perpetrated in the church. It has achieved its desired result - to ensure that nobody should ever feel secure or stable in his position any more, but conscious that whatever authority he may exercise is only by your favour.

It was by a master stroke of tactics that, after the Council, all the effectiveness was taken out of the Dicasteries of the old Curia and their functions transferred to the new post-Conciliar secretariats, in such a manner that nobody was manifestly dispossessed while in effect all were deprived of their powers in favour of the new teams, consisting wholly of progressives. A further decision, to review all Curial functions at five yearly intervals, completed the process, leaving your civil service bereft of all independence. But enough of this topic! The Curia, weighted down by the intolerant, dishonest, and incompetent yoke of the Secretariat of State, waits patiently - for a change of Pope - so that it may recover once again its liberty and stability, its competence and good cheer!

You decided - against the Council itself, which had weighed up the pros and cons of the matter - that bishops should retire at seventy-five. Their retirement, however, was not to be enforced automatically, but to depend on your decision in each case, thus leaving the ageing bishops at the mercy of your whim and despotism. As a result of this innovation, decided upon by yourself, in secret and announced unexpectedly, the very nature of the bishop's office has been changed. From being the Father and Shepherd of his people, he has been made into a civil servant constantly concerned with keeping on the right side of the central Power.

Just now you are aiming your attack against the College of Cardinals and its jealously guarded prerogative of electing the Popes. Without preliminary warning, without consultation with anybody and least of all with those personally affected, you decreed that the Cardinals should be deprived of their membership of the Conclave on attaining the age of eighty. Such mistrust of the elderly is against all the decencies of human civilisation as well as the wisdom of the Scriptures. But you don't care about either when it comes to following your passion to adopt new ideas. We are left wondering whether such mutilation of the College of Cardinals for entirely arbitrary reasons does not invalidate its juridical faculty. Certain learned canon lawyers have said it does, and produced evidence to back up their view. To pierce the enigma of your true motives underlying this decision has not been simple. At first sight, it would seem that you are making arrangements to ensure that your side remains in power, and modifying the electoral College accordingly. But there is more behind it than the mere rigging of the next election.

Quite recently, your plan began to be laid bare. First you get rid of some thirty aged Cardinals, and you limit the maximum number of Cardinals in the Conclave to 120. Then you announce, rather vaguely, the next stage in the process leading to the ultimate aim which you have already decided upon. This is to admit - maybe - the Oriental Patriarchs to the Conclave, and perhaps also the members of the Synodal Secretariat. (*) The numbers are in any case insignificant, some dozen new members at most. And then, in your Discourse of 5th March, in the presence of the new Cardinals, you give yourself away sufficiently for at least the initiated to grasp the full extent of your plan. The introduction into the Conclave of "certain national representatives" would finally "bring the Church "into line with our day and age", allowing her to embark, "without timidity , on a course directed to the future".

"Do not ever contemplate remaining outside the mainstream of life...Remember, rather, that, united as you are to the Church of Peter, you are in the vanguard of those great movements which carry mankind towards its inescapable destiny, which however remains so difficult to attain: we are referring to unity, fraternity, justice, liberty within an ordered system, personal dignity, respect for life, mastery of the earth without becoming its prisoner, culture which is not allowed to lead men astray..."(**)

You may speak in riddles, Most Holy Father, but since 1964 there have been quite a few of us who have seen through these. We have realised that you are preparing to play your part in the movement towards World Democracy and are to this end carrying out a step-by-step revolution in the Roman Church. Today you are making arrangements to democratise her system of electing her...President. You have fixed the number of

(*) Allocation to the Consistory of Cardinals, 5th March 1973

(**) Discourse of 5th March 1973.

Cardinals taking part in a Conclave at 120: this number is invariable, while that of the "national representatives" is variable - 8 or 10 today, and tomorrow perhaps 100, 200, 500? It will not be long before your end - to make the Papal Election comparable in all respects to the Presidential Election of the great modern democracies - has been attained, and the Church will then indeed be able to claim to have "fallen into line with our day and age", to have formed "a credible relationship with the world", to have "entered into the movement of history which is constantly evolving and changing, proceeding ceaselessly to new conquests whose end and aim is an eschatological one". (*)

The reality is less edifying. In "falling into line with modern society", the very soul of the Church has changed, and she has invested herself with the characters of a techno-bureaucracy and police state. The ecclesiastical Hierarchy has lost its canonical order, its force and stability, yielding its place to the anonymous tyranny of a system where every little despot can prepare a good place for himself. Tyranny and anarchy begin to chase each other in circles once a stable and lawful social order has given way to one based on the arbitrary rule of individual wills.

RELIGION IS BECOMING EXTINCT.

There is always some hidden cause underlying the sudden and widespread collapse of the religion of an entire people. But when it is the Creation of the Holy Spirit - that which is eternal and ever new - which is thus affected, there must indeed be very grave human sin to explain it. Our sacred Religion cannot recede on a worldwide scale unless there has been serious failing in the sphere of Prayer, of Faith and of Morals.

PRAYER...

You yourself do pray, so we understand. Though this is a matter which concerns the public example set by the Pope it is nevertheless so closely linked with his private spiritual life that I cannot say much on this sad aspect of the present Pontificate. What is clearly evident is that all forms of devotion and public prayer have as good as disappeared under your Pontificate and that you have done nothing to remedy the situation, apart from sometimes expressing vain regrets...Only the "Eucharistic Celebration" remains and that too tends to be replaced, on an equal footing, by "celebrations of the word" and "ecumenical celebrations" which are as empty as the "divine worship" of the Protestants. It is only in the private gatherings of traditionalists that you still find the Rosary being recited. In any case, unless I am mistaken, you are never seen praying in public? During your visit to Fatima, we never saw nor heard you say so much as a single Ave Maria!

FAITH...

I have already had something to say on this subject earlier on. Here I will comment only on one aspect which seems to have passed unnoticed, though it is very significant. It concerns those Wednesday Allocutions, Most Holy Father, which seem to be full of pity but where nevertheless, you always give excessive emphasis to doubt, objections, hypotheses contrary to divine revelation...And then, when you come to the point where you must give the Christian answer and expound the true doctrine, there is never enough time left. Psychologically, you seem to make yourself into an apologist for doubt, and we are left wondering which side you are on - that of the objection or the Christian answer. It sometimes happens that the avowed enemies of the Faith quote your very words in order to make their point. So the Rock begins to crumble, and Faith to disappear the whole world over.

MORALS...

The heyday of the Council and your own accession seem to have coincided with a general decline in morals. Permissiveness began to spread rapidly throughout the world. Why this coincidence? Perhaps people understand you better than you realise. They know that you are prepared to excuse any breaches of the moral law - out of pity for the poor unfortunates, no doubt - and that however loudly you may speak against sin you will never go so far as to take any canonical sanctions against the offenders or their accomplices.

In more general terms, it is generally held nowadays and indeed, has been for a century or more, that "progress" in thinking goes hand in hand with relaxation of moral standards. That is why all your Predecessors fought heroically against this so-called "progress" as well as against the corruption of morals. In seeking to come to terms with modern standards and to open the Church to modern "progress" you rule out the possibility of combating immorality with any hope of success. We all saw the pictures that showed you receiving Claudia Cardinale and Lollobrigida in St Peter's on the occasion of some "Day" of radio or cinema. You certainly showed yourself to be "with it". Were you really glad to receive these idols of the cinema screens, public sinners showing no sign

(*) Discourse of 5th March, 1973.

of repentance, who went so far as to come to the Papal audience wearing the shortest of mini-skirts? You paid your homage to the permissive society and from that day, indecency in fashion had won the day: for what priest would feel able to forbid something which the First among priests had considered acceptable in the chief Sanctuary of Christendom?

I know that - in order to avoid such sacrilege taking place within the Basilica itself - you had built a vast modern audience hall. But the remedy is worse than the disease. The scope and licence allowed to immorality, in your very presence, has thereby been increased manifold, and what little of piety had previously remained thanks to the sacred character of the place has now gone by the board.

The marriage of priests.

As in the decadent epochs of the past, it is through the marriage of priests that moral ruin has entered the Church. But today, for the first time in history, this has taken place with the consent - with the help even - of the Vicar of Christ!

Here, once more, your part in the scandal was played in an enigmatic manner, and scarcely anyone saw through your hidden intention. Though I myself had understood enough from reading your Encyclical Sacerdotalis Coelibatus (24th June 1967), I did not wish to write anything about it, and refrained for a long time (*). For in that document you appear to be defending celibacy in what seems at first sight a firm manner. But the appearance serves to cover up your ulterior motive. First, and paradoxically, you expound the difficulties of celibacy, the objections and obstacles to it, but only to decide, for the present, "to maintain intact the discipline concerning ecclesiastical celibacy". And then you list all the conditions which are necessary for it. The people concerned must be adequately prepared, well adapted, well tried and tested. So you believe that, provided celibacy is well prepared for - as it now will be, bearing in mind all the conditions you have listed - there will in the future be no more failures? But what about the past? In the days before the science of psycho-pedagogy had reached its present advanced state - before you came on the scene? Here, you give in, and show yourself ready to believe anything they may tell you. You would evidently have been prepared to release anybody who happened to ask (**). And in that terrible paragraph 83 you ascribe "the real responsibility" not to the wretched priests who were defrocked, but to the Church herself, as she was before your day, to her wrong sense of values and to the difficult life she demanded from her priests.

In addition to this, you created an ad hoc Commission on 2nd February (note the date!) 1964, and it began to be made widely known that the Pope was ready to permit the annulment of vows and to authorise the marriage - in a church, lawful and sacramental - of those priests who really wanted it. A certain Versailles priest, whose request had been rejected by Pius XII and by John XXIII was formally informed that it was worth his while to apply again, for the new Pope, who had more generous ideas, was likely to accede to his request. He wrote about it in the papers and even made a book out of his story. A flood of applications followed and, when the judicial machinery became discredited, a veritable torrent of unofficial departures. It has become the highminded and exalted task of the Sacred Congregation for the Defence of the Faith (sic) and indeed, your own, to make it possible for these precious priests to espouse their beloved. In 1972, there were 4000 official dispensations - in other words, they were being dealt with at the rate of 11 cases a day. The total number who left may be nearer 10,000 - while the number of ordinations in that year was 2,800. Nobody can deny that you have been more successful than Luther! (***)

This, Most Holy Father, comes of your Cult of Man and human Love - which leads to disregard for God.

The question arises whether you have in fact the right to dispense from their vows those who have, as we say, espoused God. Of those theologians who do grant you such a right, the greater part consider that you should, as a matter of justice and fairness, make use also of that other, simpler right which would follow a fortiori - that of annulling unhappy marriages! This too has become a matter for discussion, when you can claim the right to suppress the Index and the Holy Office, the right to change the Mass and to forbid the Old Rite - all those "rights" which you are the first in the history of the Church to lay a claim to, as part of that vast right which you have as-

(*) Till October 1971 - in CRC 49, CCR 20.

(**) Sacerdotalis Coelibatus, No 84.

(***) Acts of the Holy See in 1971 (1972 Edition).

sumed - to "reform" the Church even to the extent of changing our very religion. What is beyond dispute - and scandal enough in itself - is that you are prepared in everything to go to the very limits of your right, if not beyond, in order to pander to the wishes and passions of men and women at the expense of the sacred Rights of God. It is enough for a priest to fall in love with a woman for you to give him, in the very name of the Sacred Heart of Jesus that he had espoused, the discharge papers which he is asking for. Because, according to the new form of dispensation, it is supposed to be God Himself who releases these priests from their vows when they receive, from the diocesan officials, their permission to marry. So, the very next day, they can go into a church and ask God, like the betrayed Spouse, to accord a cheerful blessing to their new union! In the old days, when the contract was broken, this was an act of the human partner: today, it is supposed to be that of God and the Church! In the past, the fellow priests of one who had thus repudiated his vows stood by waiting for his return and praying for him. That God kept faith with those who had espoused and afterwards betrayed Him served also as an example and encouragement to married people and to parents betrayed by their children; the prodigal son knew that there was a welcome for him on his return. But you have changed all this, and introduced into the mystical union between God and the priest, a form of divorce by mutual consent! You will not have it that the Love of God should ever be seen to surpass that of the human creature, you will not allow the latter to be sacrificed for the greater Love of God. And so you arrange things so that it is God who, out of pity, agrees to give up His claim in order to ensure the creature's happiness!

It is you who have put temptation in the way of your priests, who have made yourself the powerful accomplice of the Demon, the evil woman and the flesh. And for the fallen priest, you are indeed the greatest enemy who, in joining him sacramentally to the companion of a brief moment of folly, forbids him to return to his first and eternal Love.

It is through your permissiveness that the question of marriage for priests has become a constant subject for campaigns in the press, for public discussions and study groups. The faithful are acutely aware that the image of the priest, so exalted and pure before your day, has become tarnished and degraded. Unbelievers, non-practising Catholics, have reason to be pleased. For them, their parish priest, or the priest from whom they had once received their First Holy Communion, remained a living reproach to their own evil conduct and an incessant reminder of the need for their conversion. Today the priest is generally suspected of being just as much at the mercy of the flesh and its passions as any other mortal. He is no longer a reproach to anyone.

But what else could you have done? Most Holy Father, there was only one thing to do and that was to say NO, like your Predecessors! But that would have caused distress; it would have involved refusals and reprimands, even punishment. It would have meant insisting on self-denial, forcing chastity upon them. But that precisely is what Charity itself would have obliged you to do, Most Holy Father, were not the love which you have for others a form of pride and egoism, of self-love rather than true charity. You are prepared to consent to evil rather than risk your popularity. There can be no other way to save the Church from the disgrace involving her priests and religious than to make a clean break with all the new rules and customs, with the new mentality associated with this Pontificate, and to burn or disinfect everything with which this has come into contact. Unless it be cut short, how can the Church ever climb out of the present depths?

YOUR BETRAYAL OF CHRISTENDOM.

The scandal of moral corruption rests on evidence which is incontestable: the facts are not open to debate. The scandal involved in your betrayal of Christendom in the political field also rests on incontestable evidence, but the interpretation of the facts by yourself and your supporters is so different that the scandal exists only for "the people of the right", while "the people of the left" will rather applaud it. That is because, in our Western society, everything connected with politics has become a matter for personal opinion and individual liberty: this may be madness but it is a fact. The essence of the scandal is no less criminal for being so regarded by only one section.

We are Catholics over and above everything else, and this applies to you, Most Holy Father, to a supreme degree. Our loyalty to God and to Christ links us to that part of the world which is Christian, more especially to Latin Europe, where Christianity, though battered by assaults from within and without, remains most in evidence. Our love for the Church embraces those countries which have numerous churches, where the people are Catholic, where the State openly professes the Catholic Faith. Going beyond this circle, now unfortunately only very small, there are those other countries which merit

our preference, where the people are Christian and our holy Religion can be freely practised and preached to the people. That is what we know as the free world - which, as the result of colonisation and the work of the missionaries, would before long have spread to cover the whole of our planet. It is good to remind ourselves that the world was already well on the way to becoming Christian when the enemy stepped in.

Please forgive me, Most Holy Father, if I remind you of certain facts and of the obligations of a supernatural loyalty which you refuse to acknowledge.

The enemy I am referring to is not the Russian people, nor the Chinese people: it is, quite simply, atheistic Communism which, with lies and murder as its tools, is systematically conquering the world and installing its imperialism and its slavery, leading to a tyranny and a wholesale persecution of everything that is Christian, such as has never been known before.

Communism is overtly in command in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, whence it towers over Central Europe, and it is at the same time making headway in the Far East and the Middle East, ready to encircle Europe by way of Southern Asia and Africa. In addition, it has established a foothold in Cuba and also - with the help of the Church and so with your permission, in Chile. It is also spreading elsewhere, in the free world, under cover of the famous democratic liberties and "in particular, that of religious liberty" (*). It is aided and abetted by those nebulous doctrines of "neutrality" and "peaceful coexistence", which are supposed to be so useful for business and finance. The gangrene has set in, and forms the greatest conceivable threat to the continued existence of mankind.

The other enemy, closely linked with this one, is the Anticolonialism of the Third World, a racist form of nationalism which seeks to attain independence with the help of revolution. Its seeds were sown, alas, by our own lay and socialist co-religionists and it has resulted in the wars of liberation won over us by the colonised peoples as a result of our own weakness.

Thus we can see the Free World shrinking in size, while the Communist World is in a state of expansion and "colonisation". It has, for all practical purposes, disintegrated, leading to the formation of a Third World filled with revolt and jealousy against its former colonisers, and drawn towards international Communism by the manoeuvres and ideological pressure of the latter. It was not difficult to foresee that the lands lost to the Christian West would fall prey to the expansion of the Communist ruled East and Far East. Unable to proceed directly across Central Europe, the subversive and military forces of Communism are carrying on the war by stirring up anti-colonial "wars of liberation" throughout the Third World. And, while Europe remains threatened by direct invasion, North America is also at risk as a result of subversive activity, with the continuing risk of total war.

And what does the Pope do to help mankind faced with the threat of such a vast peril? What does he preach in this ideological struggle? What tactics does he employ when all the peoples have "met together against the Lord and against his Christ" (Ps. II, 2)?

The Pope is betraying the Christian world.

Your so-called Neutrality.

In 29th January 1965 you made one of those surprise gestures, one of those enigmatic "acts" which have the appearance of being "Pontifical Acts", and which I have referred to as "scandals": you gave back to the Turks the Standard of Lepanto. The trophy had been preserved for almost four hundred years in St Mary Major, as an ex voto offering to the Blessed Virgin, Guardian and Protector of Christendom. The flag had been taken in the heat of the fight from a Turkish admiral during the famous naval battle on the 7th October 1571 which saved the West from the Moslem threat. St Pius V had a vision of the victory at the very moment it was taking place, and he instituted the Feast of Our Lady of the Most Holy Rosary in order to perpetuate this miraculous outcome won through her intercession. The wars of religion were dividing and devastating Europe at that time, making it an easy prey to invasion by barbarians.

When making this gesture you issued a Brief addressed to the Turkish authorities, and this gives us some clue to your real meaning: "The wars of religion are finished for good." The action and the words which accompanied it amount, together, to a scandal whose repercussions are infinite and irreversible.

With reference, first, to the past, your act seems to cast doubt upon the lawfulness of the Crusade preached by St Pius V and the genuinely miraculous nature of the

(*) Discourse of Pope Paul VI to the UN.

victory, as well as on the merits of the Pope who had called upon Christians to fight, and on the genuineness of his vision. But over and above all this, it is an insult to Our Lady of the Most Holy Rosary and casts a veil of shame over her Feast on the 7th October. To return the Standard implies that you feel the need to make honourable amends to the Moslem Turks and are ready to trample upon the Church's past.

But the enigmatic element in your gesture has a bearing on the present rather than on the past: this is your way of making it clear that the new-style Papacy dissociates itself from the conflicts of those days, that it will not recognise anyone's right to fight in the name of Christianity, nor look upon any people or state, even on one that persecutes the Church, as an enemy of God, against which all the rest are in duty bound to unite in a Crusade.

The wars of religion are over for good? Let us forget about the Turks, to whom your gesture meant nothing and who greeted it with indifference or even irritation. But what about the others? Are you no longer prepared to condemn even the most savage of persecutors? Will you not bless the flags of those Christians who fight against them?

At a moment when the West is once again oblivious of the peril in which it finds itself, when it is growing cold in the Faith and engrossed in its vices, when it is so sorely in need of the Pope to wake it up and give it courage to resist aggression and invasion - for is the state of affairs in 1971 not similar to that in 1571, and is the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean not a threat a thousand times greater than the Turks of yore? - at the very moment when another St Pius V should rise up and order pilgrimages to St Mary Major in Rome, condemn the Communist infiltrations in the Church and in the free world, warn the Third World against the seductive treachery of Marxism, make himself the spokesman of the persecuted Christians, the Catholics suffering martyrdom, and, finally, bless the armies of the West fighting against the Communist forces or preparing to resist their onslaught...

..at this tragic moment in history, the Pope - you, Most Holy Father - goes to the length of returning to the enemies of old, a piece of ancient rag which had lain at the feet of the Blessed Virgin in Rome as the ex voto offering of Christendom thankful for its deliverance!

I happen to recall this particular gesture among so many others which, not taking much note of political or diplomatic happenings, I let pass unnoticed. There is a whole series of acts of "neutralism", of heartfelt praise bestowed on the apostles of peaceful coexistence in our day, which I may have noted in passing in my Letters to my Friends, and later in the CRC, or which I could look up if this Process required it. These various words and gestures were but a smoke screen hiding the very real movement of your diplomacy and your heart in the direction of Moscow and Peking, and towards guerillas and terrorists in every country in the world.

You were glad to receive Martin Luther King! You lavished praise upon Gandhi and Nehru. You remained blind and deaf to the pro-Communist campaigns and encouragement of Black racialism by the first of these and the infringement of peace and the rights of peoples by the latter apostles of a false Non-Violence, prepared to annex the ancient French towns of the Indies and Catholic Portuguese Goa. Your heart remains ever cold in the face of the misery of your own children unjustly reduced to slavery. You don't want to know anything about it, you say. When your politics are at stake, you are prepared to disclaim knowledge of anything or anybody.

You are, on the other hand, always ready to speak out against every injustice, every death sentence, every case of torture, anywhere in the world provided only it can be laid at the door of a Christian power and is carried out as part of the fight against subversion. I happen to remember, as it was one of the first of such instances, your intercession, conjointly with "Mr H.", the U.N. President, and "Mr. K.", on behalf of three "Black trade unionists" condemned to death, for whom you requested a reprieve of the South African President. That was in 1964, soon after Ecclesiam Suam. You wanted to make sure of being included among the "defenders of justice" and the "fighters for peace". A little later you championed the cause of Civil Rights for the Blacks in the United States. And you offered your services, in your capacity of a "friend of Man", as intermediary in Vietnam, in Cyprus, anywhere where there happened to be war.

But in your determination to ignore "wars of religion", you shut your eyes to Communist aggression, to atheistic ideology in action, to revolutionary subversion. You claim always to be "neutral"; that is, you see an a priori equality between the claims and rights of Communism and the Free World, between aggressor and victim, between persecutor and the oppressed. You espouse non-violence, you seek settlements through negotiation; and backed by these high-sounding conceptions of human relationships you try to impose upon the Free World the obligation of giving up all resistance and seek-

ing "peace at any price", even at the cost of giving way to the enemy. It is thanks to you, to your pacifism and "neutrality", that violence, aggression, and subversion are everywhere successful and the Free World knows only one defeat after another and is in continuous retreat before the modern Barbarians....with the sole exception of those parts where they refuse to listen to you, but go on fighting - even when you, like the rest of the world, are against them - because they are certain of being in the right, and have remained proud of their Catholic Faith: I am speaking about Portugal.

We are not underestimating the sordidness of the Free World, all the injustice, corruption, and religious divisions, not to speak of its rapidly spreading apostasy. It remains nevertheless a Christian world where the Church is free and able to work for the salvation of souls and the reform of society. By comparison with the savageness and terror of Communism and the anarchy and physical wretchedness of the Third World, it remains a world of civilisation, peace and prosperity: a privileged and happy world.

What is so shocking is that you should flatter it in its unbelief and religious indifference, its immorality and its disregard for the Laws and Rights of God. You do not even try to correct its faults. Have you ever done anything to shake its pride and selfishness, its sensuality and materialism, its utter disregard for the supernatural, by reminding it of its Christian calling and of the need to become Catholic once more? You prefer, rather, to stir up the peoples to rebel against it, in the name of justice. You call upon it to share out its wealth equally among all, in a way which is a practical impossibility, and then you accuse it of racialism and violence, not in any attempt to correct its faults, but in order to aid its condemnation at the tribunal of world politics. Your seeking for justice is not guided by any zeal for God or for the salvation of souls, but by your interest in the progress of revolution.

You have no love for the Free World. For if you loved it, you would be harder on its faults; you would show yourself strict without fear of unpopularity. And in so doing, you would be conferring an immense benefit upon it, for it does indeed stand in urgent need of correction. But you would also take care to warn it against the threat it faces at the hands of the barbarians. You would remind it of its duty to defend its own life and liberty, and that of the peoples over whom it has for centuries exercised a benevolent protectorate. In so doing, you would be assuming the role of a St Gregory, of a St Pius V of the present day, for they were, in their time, the defenders of the City, the saviours of civilisation.

But you have no love for us. Perhaps you love the Third World, the Communist World, better? If you had a true love for them, you would be concerned for the liberation of their peoples, and above all for their conversion, rather than seek the goodwill of their despotic rulers. What you love is your own image upon the scene of international politics, and therefore you take care to be on the winning side, idolised by crowds, and covered with honours by the great of this corrupt world. You demonstrate your neutrality by constantly invoking justice, liberty, equality, fraternity, prosperity, development, peace... We all know that these catch phrases, to which all can give what meaning they please, finally come to roost in the nest of the victors.

A rabid Anticolonialism.

It is certain gestures - unexpected, enigmatic - which stand out in my memory more than the myriads of words and formal rulings which it would be impossible for me to attempt to list. These deliberate acts of scandal shock public opinion but they are carried out too swiftly to allow any effective opposition or protest. Nevertheless, they leave a lasting impression and their full implication often does not become evident until much later.

In January 1965, for example, you included in your list of new Cardinals, among many bishops who merited the honour, the Archbishop of Algiers, Mgr Duval. This caused feelings to rise in France, and especially among our unfortunate "repatriates". But there was a tendency among our friends, who at the time still bore you a religious respect and an absolute confidence, to explain this decision as having been made at the urgent request of de Gaulle and Ben Bella. This interpretation - which, incidentally, showed you in a far from honourable light - demonstrated that your children were conscious of the paradox in the decision to raise to the rank of Cardinal a bishop who had shown preference to the Moslem terrorists over the peace-loving - too peace-loving - Christians of his own flock, and who had, as the result of his own efforts, lost all but a handful of his million-and-a-half faithful, not to speak of all the murders, desecration of churches and cemeteries and general devastation of all things Christian carried out with his backing by his Moslem friends. Such an accomplice of assassins you made into a Cardinal!

I tried at the time to explain what lay behind your action, to analyse your hidden

intention: "This confirms, alas, my conclusions concerning the New Church: we see how she makes a hero of this sorry idealist who has been doing his best to destroy everything Christian." Only, when I said "the Church", I was speaking euphemistically: I should have specified: "You, Most Holy Father"!

Anticolonialism had always existed in Rome and when you returned there after your ten years in exile, it was much stronger than before. But it was you who strengthened its hand through your indefatigable diplomacy and innumerable discourses. This becomes evident on reading through the files of your speeches in Africa.

Thus, when you went to Uganda on 29th July 1969, the aim of your visit was supposed to be "an essentially religious one". But during its course you gave a thousand signs of respect and affection - not to speak of material generosity towards his poor - to that bloodthirsty thief Obote, then Prime Minister, of whom the country was to rid itself before long. And you sent out from there, from the centre of Africa, a message of liberation and racial equality which amounts to an unequivocal call for a general uprising of Africa against the White man - in Rhodesia, South Africa, Mozambique, Angola. For these peoples living in peace, could there have been a more dangerous incitement to subversion than came from you?

"Paul VI (by comparison with the Bishops of Africa) was not afraid to commit himself. He thus stated emphatically, in the face of Portugal and Rhodesia, that the Church gives her unreserved support to the claims for the liberty of the national territories - even if in certain cases this has to be achieved in stages. The Church, for her part, had contributed to the attainment of independence by African states by her insistence on the dignity of persons and peoples and by helping them to discover their dignity. She was setting an example, also, by Africanising her hierarchy or preparing to do so where it had not yet been possible. No African state had anything to fear from the Church, rather the contrary." (*)

Did you not realise that in treating Obote as a brother and his Portuguese neighbour as a Samaritan, your anti-White - your Black - racialism was turning you into an accomplice of brutality? You are truly a disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre in taking sides for "the good savage" against the European....

"This courageous discourse not only gave rise to repeated applause from the audience, but also delighted the African journalists present, who rushed to the telephones and teleprinters in order to make the speech 'resound through the length and breadth of Africa' - to borrow an expression from the concluding remarks of the discourse." (*)

These discourses formed a skilful and formidable intervention against the Whites in Africa. Your demand for Black independence and the ending of all racial discrimination was made in the name of justice and peace. You specified however that these should be brought about through obedience to the International Organisations and not through violence. In other words, all conflict must cease and the opponents submit unconditionally to the decision of the United Nations. This is where your bias comes in. For in thus insisting on lawful arbitration you condemn in advance those who will not agree to this and continue to fight, while you know full well, and also make it quite clear to the Blacks, that the majority vote of the UN would guarantee a decision in their favour. Thus your mediation in the name of the Gospel, of Peace and Justice, of Law and Non-Violence, is tantamount to a betrayal of established states who, whether you like them or not, are leading a lawful existence, in favour of guerilla movements and all the various forms of Black terrorism.

What is so courageous about the things you said? In speaking against colonialism, you are saying the same things as the UN, or the forces of international capitalism - concerned only with their immediate self-interest - or imperialist Communism, either the Russian or the Chinese variety, or the left-wing intellectuals of the West - not to speak of the young and progressist missionaries who are so convinced that the Church will have a great part to play after it has helped the "oppressed" peoples to throw off their yoke while at the same time ridding itself of the shameful association with colonialism. In other words, you are in good company! You are only saying what the rest of the World is saying: does it take so much courage to do that?

The World is on the side of the terrorists, it is ready to excuse the brutal murders of women and children. And so you too, are prepared to receive them at the Vatican. That was an occasion which illustrates to perfection the type of scandal - apparently without rhyme or reason - which is calculated to further your designs by "unblocking" the status quo. On the 1st July 1970, three leaders of the terrorist movements in An-

(*) Both quotations are from La Croix, 4th August 1969.

gola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, and the Cape Verde Islands, were received by you at the "kissing of hands" which followed the public audience.

The Osservatore Romano, faithful to your well-tried tactics, went out of its way to deny the calculated intention that lay behind your gesture: "To express surprise, or to see it as a gesture of approval, would be a misinterpretation." Its own explanation is ready to hand: "The Pope receives, as part of his mission, all those who request the consolation of his blessing (sic!) That was the case with the individuals in question..." Your Secretariat of State, too, is ready to promote hypocrisy into a legitimate tool of diplomacy: "There was no question of an audience in the strict sense of the word; but in the context of a gathering of a more general nature.... in his capacity of Universal Shepherd...the Holy Father could not very well have replied with an absolute refusal...without any regard to the political designation assumed by these individuals, but purely in their capacity of Catholics or Christians, as they had been referred to in the request...the Holy Father...who had no concrete knowledge of their activities, and despite the fact that it did not lie within his competence to form a political assessment of the concrete situation in the region(sic) whence they came.. etc., etc." Lies galore to support the terrorism.

The wind having thus been taken out of the sails of any complaints made by Portugal, the venom contained in this scandalous gesture was enabled to exert its full effect. Let me however, in parentheses, express my admiration for the generous outlook, condescension, and prudence shown by Professor Caetano, the Portuguese Head of State, in this matter.

"It is worthy of note...that Portugal, though calling itself a Catholic country, shows no regard in its colonial policy for the repeated teaching of the Popes for the rights of men and peoples. Significantly, Paul VI presented the three African leaders with a copy of the Encyclical Populorum Progressio. It is quite clear, also, that the three men had not, in any sense of the word, 'forced their way' into the Vatican, but that the Pope had personally desired to meet them. It goes without saying that such a gesture does not imply that he gives his blessing to terrorism, any more than the fact of continuing relations with the Portuguese government signifies approval of the action of the Portuguese forces in Africa... But the audience on the 1st of July does, in a certain sense, constitute a warning to the Portuguese government; for it demonstrates to the nationalists that they are not looked upon as outcasts from the Christian community, and that the Church does not stand surety for the colonial order established in the 'Portuguese territories' (the inverted commas appear in the original report)." (*)

Your supposed neutralism is not able to hide from anybody your support for subversion, together with the disdain for international law which this implies, and together also - believe me, I am weighing my words carefully - with a disdain for the moral law of the Gospels and the Divine Law. I can think of nothing worse than Church authorities putting out lies in order to serve the interests of political murder. I would rather have the man with the knife between his teeth than the Vatican reporters assigned to such a task.

Your unconditional Procommunism.

A Pope must, by definition, be unconditionally opposed to Communism. But in your case, this would form an obstacle to your Great Design of universal reconciliation. So you have come to favour Communism, though in a circumspect manner, hedged around with numerous precautions. You are, in fact, a crypto-Communist. I shall not recount here the history of this gradual change of allegiance, this inversion of Vatican diplomacy, this careful and subtle rehabilitation of Marxist-Leninism which has today reached the stage at which Catholics in Western countries are given the go-ahead for joining the Communist party (**) and a president of the movement Pacem in Terris - that is, a certain agent of Communism, is installed in a bishopric in Czechoslovakia.

You started with one trump card: the famous distinction made in Pacem in terris between the "historical movement" and the "ideology". While the former is fixed, the latter is in a state of evolution. Assuming thus that Communism is in a state of evolution and betterment, you felt justified in holding out your arms towards it, receiving its emissaries, and generally working together with it "for justice and peace in the world". Are these, the key words of your treason, not enough to bring to our mind - and to your own - all the facets of that fabric of scandal prepared by your Casaroli and his team over the past ten years?

(*) From La Croix, 9th July 1970, quoted in Documentation Catholique, 70, 718.

(**) Conference by Mgr Maragrin, 16th January 1973, at the Mutualité in Paris.

Sometimes it is the apparently trivial acts of scandal whose ultimate significance is greatest. There was, for example the "sanatio in radice" of the civil marriage of the Rev. Tondi, which you accorded him in 1965 - a service rendered to your former fellow worker at the Secretariat of State, who had become a Communist - let me see - before or after leaving you? The granting of such a dispensation from the religious form of marriage - the application of canon 1138 - is something extraordinary (i.e. the recognition as canonically valid, of a civil marriage contracted before any dispensation from the priestly vows - Tr.'s note) Such a favour done to a former colleague - and an ardent worker for Moscow - poses an enigma (*). I think I know the answer - and so do you...

Then there was that other great scandal which passed from fact into the records without bringing any serious criticisms upon its instigator, Mgr Glorieux who, it is generally believed, would never have dared to do what he did had he not been certain of your backing: the silencing, on a fraudulent pretext, of the 300 bishops who in September 1965 petitioned for a formal condemnation of Communism by the Council. It was thus clear from the word go that it was the Pope's wish that the Council should not issue such a condemnation; Communism, in other words, was to be rehabilitated!

I discussed at the time how your manner of referring to it, in an oblique fashion in your earliest Encyclical, was calculated to open the Church's door to dialogue, reconciliation, and collaboration with the Communists. Your social Documents, of course, carried this a considerable stage further. It would require a full and detailed study of your allusions to the persecutions and of your expressions of affection for its victims, to show conclusively - and backed by evidence - what public opinion has already grasped instinctively - that you desire at the very best to forget these unfortunates and to keep clear of the problem because it might interfere with your political moves towards good relations with the Communist States. But suddenly, in October 1971, the blinding truth burst like a flash of lightning upon the darkness in which the Vatican had enveloped the facts. Cardinal Mindszenty was forced - morally forced by you - to leave Hungary where he had languished, for Rome where you would be in the position to prevent his publishing his Memoirs. And there was heard the shattering cry of Cardinal Slipyi by a Synod struck with sudden consternation, ashamed before this Confessor of the Faith, this survivor of the Soviet prisons, giving vent to his indignation against those traitors in Rome and elsewhere who were making their peace with the persecutors and forgetting about the millions of their brethren, hunted, deported and martyred by Soviet Communism. All present were forced to listen:

"Out of fifty-four million Ukrainian Catholics, ten million have died as a result of the persecutions. The Soviet regime has suppressed all the dioceses. The bodies of the dead would build a mountain and yet there is nobody, even within the Church, who will so much as defend their memory. Thousands upon thousands of faithful remain imprisoned or deported.

But the diplomacy of the Vatican (that means yourself!) desires that we should keep silent about them, for they interfere with its negotiations. We are back in the days of the catacombs. Thousands upon thousands of the Church's faithful have been deported to Siberia and as far as the Polar Circle but the Vatican remains wilfully ignorant of this tragedy. Can it be that the martyrs have become an embarrassment to the Church?"

It seemed, for one moment, as though the Church of Silence were going to disturb the silence of the Church. But no! For all its parliamentary set-up, the bishops who were met in this Synod had no illusion about their own power if this should come into conflict with the absolute rule of your pro-Communist Secretariat of State. Since then, things have been made as difficult as possible for Cardinal Slipyi at the hands of your Civil Service, and the tombstone has been lowered once more upon those embarrassing witnesses who are shedding their blood for Christ... But the evidence is there to condemn you, Most Holy Father, before God and before men.

There is a whole series of events testifying to your friendship towards Communism: your meetings with Gromyko and Podgorny... and those long secret sessions with the notorious - and far too young - Archbishop of Leningrad, Mgr Nikodim, who is a Soviet agent of the first rank. How is it that you have always so much to say to these people? You may like us to believe that your concern is to better the lot of the persecuted among your children - but in that case, why all the mystery surrounding these meetings?

(*) This case is discussed in Letter No 200 (The Annunciation, 1965). Fr Tondi had left the Church, formally joined the Communists, and contracted a civil marriage with a militant Communist in 1952, apparently after he had been accused, in the presence of Pius XII, of having given the Russians the names of priests sent to work behind the Iron Curtain.

And so, when we hear, today, that the man who is now secretary of the Italian Communist party - Signor Berlinguer - has been your secret diplomatic agent for the past six years, negotiating with the Communist government in Hanoi (*), we have no difficulty in realising that the Vatican has become a platform for the propaganda and diplomatic activity carried on by international Communism in its efforts to conquer the West. Today, a base for negotiations and - who knows - perhaps tomorrow its general headquarters? The lesson of Chile, where your friend Frei was replaced by the Communist Allende - who is not your enemy either - is there to teach us...

The surprises which you spring upon us have become more and more open: as public opinion becomes accustomed and more inclined to accept them, the enigmatic element is gradually being dropped. When you decided to build a hospital in war-torn North Vietnam, your gesture spoke of the terrible American bombings, of mutilated bodies and innocent civilian victims... Yes, your neutrality is always highly selective, tending to favour the interests of international Communist propaganda - until thinking people are able to say: "The Pope has made himself the quarter-master of Communism and World Revolution." (**)

Can there be any possible justification for such evident pro-Communist sympathy - one which effectively makes you into an agent and propagandist for the various Communist "peace" campaigns? Could it be a "rallying" comparable to that attempted by Leo XIII, with the aim of bringing the persecutions to an end? But that would be a sign of incredible naivete! And in any case, such a policy was absolutely condemned by all your Predecessors. Are you convinced of the victory and conquest of the whole world by Communism, and are you trying to ensure the survival of the Church by thus making friends with it - on the analogy of the "prophetic anti-colonialism" shown by Rome? But the rebuffs suffered by the Church in the Third World which she had helped to decolonise are as nothing compared with the implacable persecution which would fall to her lot from the very moment that Communism had triumphed - however much she might have contributed to achieving this victory! So why? There remains a mystery to which we have not yet found the answer.

Your message to China, your joy at the proclamation of the Cultural Revolution - including all the destruction and desecration that goes with it - put one in mind of Lamennais towards the end of his life. I hardly dare think this - but is there something about chaos itself which appeals to you?

Do you remember what you said on the Feast of the Epiphany in 1967: "We wish to tell the youth of China with what emotion and affection We look upon its present striving towards the ideals of a new life of hard work, prosperity, and harmony... We send our good wishes to China - so far from Us geographically, but so close spiritually... We should like to speak about peace also with those who are today in charge of the life of mainland China. We know to what an extent that human and Christian ideal is shared also by the people of China."

I commented at the time: "What a revelation of feelings! This harmony between Paul VI and Mao, between the innovators in the Church and the Red Guards, the mad dogs of Asia, shows up and intensifies the discord between civilised people, between Catholics. Why attempt to deny any longer that there exists between this Pope and this Council, this New Church on the one hand, and ourselves on the other, a sort of permanent excommunication."

It is significant that the last sentence of my paragraph was quoted by my then bishop, Mgr Le Couedic and a number of others after him, in various severe admonitions and warnings issued against our movement of La Contre-Réforme Catholique. For did it not amount to an open declaration of schism? But not one of them dared to give its context: they could not afford to let people know the reason for this "sort of permanent excommunication". For in that case, it would have been only too evident to their misguided flocks that the crime and the shame were on your side and not on ours. For what Catholic, faced with such a choice, would not sooner excommunicate you and your Red Guards, and remain, himself, with the Church of the Martyrs!

But, in order to find the ultimate reason of your hatred of the Christian West, of your blind anticolonialism and your unconditional pro-Communism, we have to look more deeply: for behind the strangeness, there lies the enigma, and behind the enigma, the occult...

(*) From a statement by the Vatican, 21st February 1973

(**) J. Duquesne, "The Left Hand of Christ" ("La Gauche du Christ")

THE KINGDOM OF SATAN

To shake the Church from top to bottom, to stand by and watch while religion and morals disintegrate, and make no firm, no supernaturally inspired, effort to stop this, cannot be simply the result of naivete or preoccupation with other matters. To betray Christendom for the benefit of every variety of subversion, to collaborate with international Communism in its attempts to dominate the West and prepare the way for its invasion by Bolshevism, cannot stem merely from a genuine - if unrealistic - pacifism... There is more to it than that.

Here, once again, there is more to guide us than mere conjecture. Certain scandals are well-known to all, and their meaning clear enough to those who are aware of the occult forces with which you sought to make contact - and also of that other, invisible Power to which you would not listen. Two names, the sites of two different sanctuaries, give us the clue: Manhattan, and Fatima. In other words, the centre of Freemasonry on the one hand, and on the other, the place chosen by the Immaculate Virgin, Mother of God - the home of the Powers of Darkness, and of Light.

The question which has been haunting us through the whole of this Libellum Accusationis is this: how can a Pope regard the world as intrinsically neutral, and how can he believe that both the Church collectively, and each of her faithful individually, can play their part in a new human community from which God is deliberately excluded, one based on secular values and the Cult of Man, without this leading to a weakening of their own faith, and finally to apostasy.

How can you think, speak and act as though, when the world rejects God, it did not automatically fall under another Power? How can you disregard the fact that when the great of this world refuse to serve Our Lord Jesus Christ and to honour the Blessed Virgin Mary, their souls necessarily become enslaved to the Prince of this World?

But let us not mince our words. You know, Most Holy Father - for their teaching was for you as well as for us - that all your Predecessors told us that the Powers of Satan are not satisfied with exerting an influence that is wholly invisible and immaterial, and remains confined to individuals. They become embodied also in certain institutions, carrying out their oppressive, aggressive functions in a visible manner through individuals and organisations whose distinguishing mark is that they are occult. Your Predecessors made every effort to unmask these and anathematize them, identifying them by certain characters: their opposition to the Church, their claim to be tolerant of all views, their supposed "search for truth", their frank secularism... When they recognised these marks, your Predecessors knew that they were on the scent of the Evil One and they took every care to protect Catholics from such movements:

"Let no one have any contact with those who hide their deepest intentions under the mask of universal tolerance and respect for all religions, and are obsessed with the idea of reconciling the maxims of the Gospel with those of the Revolution, Christ with Belial, and the Church with the godless State." The one who spoke thus is generally acknowledged to have been the most liberal among your Predecessors - Leo XIII(*).

Your naivete must be one of appearance only, serving to drive us straight into the jaws of the wolf - and thereafter you too turn into a ravaging wolf. If we wish to remain fully loyal to the urgent instructions of your Predecessors, then we must avoid all contact not only with the Synagogue of Satan - which implies going against your counsels, exhortations and orders - but also with yourself, who hide under a "mask of universal tolerance and respect for all religions, etc." And again, following the instruction given by St Paul to Titus: "Haereticum hominum post unam et secundam corptionem devita", (Tit. 3,10), we must avoid contact with you!

You are indeed hiding under a mask - and here I am obliged to disillusion those of our friends who are convinced that you have, for the past ten years, been hiding your orthodox Catholicism under the mask of a Mason. For it is not so: as Leo XIII and the rest of the Church's true Pastors pointed out, he who wears a mask does so in order to hide a face which is uglier than the disguise, for he intends to deceive the world. No Catholic Pontiff has ever disguised himself under a mask. It is the wolves who disguise themselves, wearing the clothing of sheep!

What we have been observing throughout the course of this Libellum is your "mask", and it is so disturbing already that we should, "after the first and second admonition, avoid" it. . (Tit. 3,10) Liberalism, Dialogue, the Cult of Man - these form your mask. But your true face, your true soul, which lie hidden beneath it - what are these like?

(*) Leo XIII, 8th December 1892

Strange Bedfellows.

On 17th January 1971 we saw, on the cover page of Documentation catholique, a picture of the Pope taking part in "the Ecumenical Celebration at the Town Hall in Sydney on 2nd December. This is appalling. There is not a single one among your 262 Predecessors who would have given himself up to such a sacrilege - and one which is committed against the very Person of the Pope. The worst of them would have been among the last to think of such a thing, for the Church would have promptly rid herself of them. For even if the men who are gathered together for these occasions are individually innocent, it is the Adversary of Christ, and not He Himself, who presides over such a confluence.

But that is not all. On 10th June 1969 - and here again we are indebted to a cover page of Documentation Catholique - you took part, together with Cardinal Willebrands, in the "common prayer at the World Council of Churches". That was even more serious, for that is the very place where the occult powers are at work for the victory of World Heresy - all the various forms of dissidence combined - over the "intolerance" and "sectarianism" of the One True Church. And that is where you go to pray! How - and to Whom - we are impelled to ask - can you pray in such a place? The reporters tell us that you even went into the "ecumenical chapel" to meditate (*).

It is generally acknowledged even by Protestants - I mean the well-informed among them - that the World Council of Churches is an offshoot of international Freemasonry, and closely linked with the other visible institutions which serve as instruments of the latter - the United Nations, UNESCO, the International Labour Organisation, the World Food and Agriculture Organisation, etc. These are all working towards that World Democracy by means of which Freemasonry seeks to achieve the reign of Satan over the world. And the other one we have just been talking about - the one where you went to pray - constitutes the Movement for its Spiritual Animation: it is the Christian religion used to aid the promotion of Satan's design. Guided by the brave denunciations of your Predecessors, we are able to recognise here the two Beasts of the Apocalypse: temporal power - the rule of Satan - on the one hand, and on the other, the New Religion placed at his service (Ap. 13)

And so, after leaving the one, you made your way, on that same 10th June 1969, to the other, and addressed the I.L.O. as one who is committed to serving the Beast, but who masquerades under the guise of a Catholic Pope in order to seduce all the peoples into his service. In your speech you ascribed to the Beast all those qualities of supernatural perfection which our Faith tells us belong to the Church alone, and you made a profession of faith in something which is part of Satan's design. It is enough to re-read your Discourse to the ILO and the comments made in the press concerning the atmosphere of that meeting, to leave us in no doubt that we have - shall we say - an admirer and wellwisher of international Freemasonry parading in the guise of Pope.

That Discourse forms a link between your Discourse to the UN Assembly on 4th October 1965 and a series of various messages - each more shattering than the last - between October and December 1970: to the United Nations, the World Food and Agriculture Organisation, and the Christmas Message to Mankind. I have made an analysis of these, and the results are appalling (**). You make every effort to carry the whole Church with you into adopting the Masonic Credo and serving the interests of the international Masonic organisations. The motto of the Great Design of these organisations - as I recalled in my analysis, for the benefit of Catholics, of your Discourse at the United Nations - is the famous one "Solve et coagula". The natural, historic and religious communities - in particular the Church and the Catholic States - where the true God is recognised as Master, are to be dissolved and then the fragmented mass of individuals thus uprooted and deprived of all direction - effectively de Christianised - is to be reconstituted into large world-wide cooperatives serving under the New Messiah, the Prince of this World.

The Masonic Brotherhood and the Rite of Initiation.

One is no longer surprised at anything. Even the most serious suspicions are justified. When the Bishop of Cuernavaca, Mendez Arceo, had asked the Council to consider reconciliation with our Masonic Brethren - only a few days after your visit to the United Nations - and Mgr Pézeril had visited a Lodge in order to explain the post-Conciliar Church's plans for the future, we could be excused wondering whether the Pope

(*) Documentation Catholique 69, 628; 20th July 1969.

(**) CRC No 40, CCR No 12

himself were not a sympathiser or even whether he had not already been initiated into the Brotherhood, and wished to indicate this by means of riddles.

For we know that on the occasion of your visit to the UN, you entered also the Masonic sanctuary of the building - the "Meditation room", in the middle of which stands "an altar to the faceless god" (*). I discussed the occult, Judeo-Masonic significance of that room, its furniture and decorations, in my Letter No 218 (**). You may even have read this, in connection with my "Process". The room represents, to all intents and purposes, the "chamber of reflection" of a Masonic Lodge, through which every candidate must pass in the course of his Initiation. Well, you passed through it; were you perhaps being initiated? And only after that were you able to speak - using correct Masonic terminology - before the General Assembly, 65 per cent of whose members belong to the Brotherhood.

Since the interment in Marseilles, "with full Masonic honours", of a certain Brother Jarnes, following the religious ceremony at the Church of Saint-Giniez, on 23rd January, it can no longer constitute any disrespect to assume that Your Holiness had wished to give a pledge of brotherhood to the Grand Freemasons of Manhattan. We are indebted to your friend Mgr Etchegaray for the following clever explanation of this your feeling of brotherhood which fits so well into the rest of your personal apostolate: "The new, harmonious, climate does not mean that there are no serious problems in this 'ecumenism' (sic) between the community of those who believe in Jesus Christ, Son of God and Saviour of the world, and the family of Freemasons who are searching for a universal religion of which all the various cults are, in their view, only passing manifestations. There is no antithesis between Faith and Reason (sic!) but their point of contact is still to be found." (***) In other words, Faith pertains to Christianity, and Reason, to Freemasonry, and some day in the future the two are to meet in a greater Ecumenism! It is one of the Brotherhood who speaks thus!

The most "serious problem", in fact, is how to accept that the Pope can think, speak, and act as one versed in Freemasonry; for your expressions of loyalty to the United Nations and its creed formed one of those scandals of which you make deliberate use to "unblock" the Church's status quo and set her moving in the direction of your Universal Brotherhood.

Towards the Restoration of World Judaism.

If you be anybody of note, and have shown some evidence of good-will towards Freemasonry, you will before long receive some decoration from the forces of International Jewry. The latter is in fact extending its rule over the world with the help of the former, which is its long-established secular branch. John XXIII discovered this to his cost in the course of the affair of the Council's Declaration concerning the Jews. Cardinal Bea and Cardinal Leger too must have been aware of this, for the former was awarded the gold medal of the B'nai-B'rith - the highest distinction of the most exalted of the international Jewish organisations - and the latter, the annual "Family of Mankind" prize of the "Anti-Defamatory League of the B'nai-B'rith" which, according to the Montreal Press, is "one of the most ancient and most influential organisations concerned with the preservation of the rights of man...At the present time it is engaged in promoting inter-religious understanding...and in working, jointly with the other democratic forces, to suppress propaganda of hate and anti-Semitism." That is your avowed programme too.

It is therefore not surprising that, after you had passed through the "Meditation Hall" - which for them has the significance of a Jewish sanctuary - the Jewish Organisations of the United Nations should have agreed to meet you, in - of all places - the Church of the Holy Family, on the 4th October 1965. And their spokesman, Philip Klutznick, expressing his joy at the fulfilment of the Biblical prophecies in the reconciliation of all men under the banner of the United Nations, was voicing, not only their belief, but yours also, as you had formulated it shortly before at the tribune of the Assembly.

Since that meeting there has been no cloud over your friendship with these "Sons of the Covenant". Cardinal Suenens pays them visits when he is in the United States and the B'nai-B'rith frequent the Vatican. You even addressed them specifically, at the public audience on 3rd June 1971. That too was an act of scandal, deliberately prepared as part of your advance, but there were no expressions of indignation. Admittedly, you

(*) Paris Match, 9th October 1965

(**) Lettres à mes Amis, 8th December 1965.

(***) From an Allocution by Rev. Vernède given under the supervision of Mgr Etchegaray. Documentation Catholique 73, 197.

spoke in English: "Dear friends, it affords Us pleasure to receive in St Peter's your distinguished group of the Anti-Defamatory League of the B'nai-B'rith. On this occasion We are glad to recall the wish of the Vatican Council 'to foster and recommend a mutual knowledge and esteem, which will come from biblical and theological studies, and brotherly discussions.' (Nostra Aetate, 4) In that ministry of reconciliation and peace which is peculiar to Us, We are especially sensitive to all forms of discrimination, which interfere with fraternal charity towards men and are an offense to human dignity and to God Himself. We have recently spoken out openly against every form of discrimination based on race, origin, colour, culture, sex, or religion (Oct. Adv. 16). We pray the Lord, Father of all, to deign to bless your efforts to create this climate between Christians and Jews, and between all men, a climate in which love shall reign for the good of all mankind."(*)

And you gave them all your blessing, Christians and Jews together, without any "defamatory discrimination". But is this lack of discrimination not fundamentally the same as Peter's denial of his Master, for the sake of keeping his peace with the Jews? And does that "reconciliation and peace" for which you are working conjointly with the B'nai-B'rith not demand that Christ should be crucified anew and denied for all eternity?

By now, Most Holy Father, no one in the Church is surprised at anything that you may do. You even received in private audience, on 17th May 1969, the President of the "Temple of Understanding", Mrs Hollister. She presented you with a miniature model of the Temple and you assured her that you would pray for the success of her work. But you were aware, through Cardinal Vagnozzi, your Apostolic Delegate in New York, of the true nature of this Temple of Understanding: "An occult enterprise of the Illuminati whose aim is the founding of "the World Religion" or "Human Brotherhood". One of its members and sponsors is the Secretary for Defence, Robert Strange McNamara... Edith K. Roosevelt tells us that the meditation room of the Temple of Understanding is to be known as the 'Hall of Illumination'. There, it is planned, the Illuminati, Masters of Wisdom, will instruct the public in the new cult of humanism. There, the citizen of the world is to cultivate universal understanding instead of remaining restricted to his particular national or religious outlook."(**)

And for this enterprise, involving the denial of Christ and the creation of a world religion which you know well enough will imply the reinstatement of Judaism, you promise to pray? Who, then, are you, Most Holy Father? Seated on the Throne of Peter, arrayed as the Vicar of Jesus Christ... could you possibly be the one we are beginning to fear that you are?

FATIMA PROFANED.

Time and again, in my anguish, I hoped that perhaps the Pope might make a pilgrimage to Fatima. I wrote on 8th December 1964: "Let us hope that before long the Pope may go on pilgrimage to Fatima in order to reveal to us the Secret of Mary." Such an encounter of the Vicar of Christ with Our Lady and with the Blessed Sacrament would, so it seemed to me, be the Sign from Heaven assuring us that God in His grace and mercy would yet save everything and restore it to its ancient splendour. All the scandals, the air of schism that hung so heavily about us, would disperse if only you made a pilgrimage to Fatima. All our confidence, our filial love, would be restored as in a baptism of grace. Once there, you would - you could not do otherwise - pray to the Blessed Virgin Mary together with that whole vast crowd of loyal, traditional Catholics, and after that you would let her speak, the Mother of God and our Mother and Protector; and you would tell us her Third Secret and accede to her requests. And then the world would become converted, beginning with us, your own sinful priests and people. In that prospect lay our hope!

You did go to Fatima, it is true. It was on 13th May 1967, fifty years to the day after the Heavenly Apparition. "Our eyes fixed on the screen, our hearts torn with anguish, the rosary between our fingers as we mingled our Aves with those of our brethren over there, we awaited what should have been the Event of the century..."

Alas, five hours later, there was no hope of peace left, and the final grace which we had hoped might follow mysteriously upon this meeting between the Vicar of Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother had been squandered." (***)

(*) Osservatore Romano, 3rd June 1971; cf Itinéraires, September/October 1971, p. 255

(**) CRC 3, p. 9, quoting, in French, from The Temple of Understanding Newsletter, June 1967, and The Herald of Freedom, 11th August 1967.

(***) Letter No 191, p. 6 (13th May 1967).

Why this feeling of certain disillusionment? Because it was only too clear from beginning to end that you had come, not to be seen but to be seen, not to listen but to speak, not to fall on your knees but to be honoured by millions prostrated at your feet, not to receive instructions from Heaven but to impose your own earthly projects, not to implore the Blessed Virgin Mary to give us peace, but to ask men to bring it about, not to sanctify your heart and purify it after having allowed it to be soiled by Manhattan, but rather to spread the atmosphere of Manhattan, of the World, even in this spot sacred to Mary. You had come in order to desecrate Fatima!

It was clear from the beginning that you intended to remain true to your own self. President Salazar is not President Obote - he is White, and civilised and Christian - one of the most outstanding Christians of the present century, and a great benefactor of civilisation - and Portugal is the one country in the world that has remained true to its Catholic Faith which is proclaimed boldly and with pride in its Constitution and safeguarded by its Concordat. And therefore, pretending you had come on a hasty pilgrimage, with no time to spare, you slighted both the country and its Head of State, so that the progressive press was able to broadcast throughout the world how you had seen fit to show your contempt for this noble people.

You had arranged to celebrate Mass in Portuguese - despite the fact that people of all tongues and all races the whole world over were watching or listening - because you wished to show the tradition-loving country of Portugal that you were on the side of the innovators, that you supported change and were prepared to place your own desires above the glory of God. The Mass was a sad and hurried one, impossible to follow - a cold and "mumbled" (*) ceremony.

You had also planned in advance a series of audiences which were to take up all your time. One in particular - an ecumenical meeting with the "representatives of the non-Catholic communities" - was highly significant. There were however only two - Presbyterians - with whom, as they did not understand the French in which you had prepared your discourse, you could only exchange a few useless words, while any number of good Catholics would have been only too pleased to speak to you, to pray with you, but were not allowed to come near you.

Your visit, taken up with your political and ecumenical daydreams, was not a pilgrimage at all, and herein lies the terrible scandal. In all those discourses we find hardly any references - and those only cold and superficial - to the Apparitions of 1917. In not wishing to visit the actual site of the apparitions in the Cova da Iria, you gave the impression - perhaps intentionally? - that you did not really believe in them. On your arrival, receiving the acclamations of the crowds for over an hour as you passed them, you failed to salute Our Lady of Fatima. Nothing escapes the television screen. Mounted on the platform, you did salute - the crowds. But Our Lady - No. You had passed her who was the object of your pilgrimage, without raising your eyes. I saw it. Nor did you recite the Rosary with the crowd, and, if you did say a single Ave, this was neither televised nor reported in the press.

Then came the moment of that great confrontation which for me - and for many others in a vague sort of way - was the last hope: your meeting with the Child of Fatima, with Lucy, the last survivor of the saintly little visionaries of 1917. For the love of mankind, for the love of the Church and of us poor lost children, for the love of your own self, Most Holy Father, you were being offered this grace by Heaven: Lucy requested a few moments of private talk with you. She had something which she wished to tell you - and no one else - in secret. One does not refuse such a request. One does not refuse to listen to the shepherdess of Fatima, to the little messenger of Heaven confirmed in grace and wisdom by fifty years in a cloister.

But you refused that grace. "At one moment", your interpreter, Fr Almeyda, said in an interview with Radio Vatican, "Lucy expressed the wish to tell the Pope something in private, but the Pope replied: 'No, not now. If you have something to tell me, let your bishop know, and he will pass it on; obey your bishop and have confidence in him.'"

And the Pope gave his blessing to Sister Lucy as a father gives his blessing to a beloved child whom he knows he will never see again." (**) Yes, there are certain graces which come your way once, and then never again...

Six days previously, on 7th May, you had manifested an entirely different sort of interest towards Claudia Cardinale and Lollobrigida when they visited St Peter's in a

(*) The term is used by Laurentin, a progressive priest writing in a French daily, quoted originally in Lettres à mes Amis, No 246.

(**) Documentation Catholique, 67, 1243.

flood of publicity. And four days later, on 17th May, you were to listen with great attention to what the Jewish president of the occult Temple of Understanding and her deputy had to say to you. But you would not listen to the message which the Blessed Virgin had the goodness to address to you personally through the mouth of Lucy, her child of predilection. And I must point out to you the wicked joy shown by all the progressive papers and the various anti-clerical media at this news. They heaved a sigh of relief! The Pope had remained firm, he had not allowed himself to be bowled over by some Heavenly Vision or Voice from On High, like the first Paul. For him it had not become the Road to Damascus!

But what was it that the child had wished to say to you, and which you had been so afraid to hear? Amongst all the heresy, schism, and scandal of which you have been guilty we could choose many possibilities. However, one probability stands out far above the rest: that this Messenger of Heaven wished - as she certainly must do - to remind you of the Will of that Authority which alone is above yours - I mean, God's Will - that you should publish to the world the Third Secret of Fatima. For the date on which it was intended to be published was 1960, and your pilgrimage took place in 1967. Today, we are in 1973, and the world is heading for its punishment.

"Your silence can have no other result", as I explained in my study (*) on the true Message of Fatima, soon after your pilgrimage, "than to transform into terrible fact the threats of new punishments which form beyond doubt the essence of the Third Secret, if only by analogy with the first two. If it is not allowed to know the terrible fate with which it is threatened by Heaven, the world will not become converted, and will drift unchecked into a mire of filth and a bath of blood. There will be a Third World War, Communism will spread its persecutions, atomic war will bring its untold ravages, and there will come the Great Apostasy of Christians. And because they have not received the warning and been called to conversion, the peoples will lose not only their lives but also their faith."

Dare you accuse me of having lied?

"We are waiting for the Sign of Jonas since 1960. All the supposed reasons against publishing the Secret only increase the responsibility of those who know it and remain silent. No, the prophetic message is neither insignificant, nor reassuring, nor restrained. It was intended to be made known to all in 1960, and the intention remains. If it was too terrifying to be made known then, it is no less so today. It remains, nevertheless, the one word capable of averting the scourge which is on the way.

Certainly, as Barthas writes, it is the threats and promises by the Queen of Heaven which are largely responsible for that anxious interest, mingled with fear and hope, with which the world regards the 'mystery' of Fatima. But nobody has the right to disappoint the world in its anxious expectation. There is rather an obligation to keep it informed of the words spoken by the Queen of Heaven. That the Message is indeed for all of us is proved by an account given by Canon Barthas which dates from 1952: 'Regarding that which remains hidden: when is the third element of the 'secret' to be revealed to us? Already in 1946, both Lucy and His Lordship the Bishop of Leiria gave me the same reply, without any hesitation or further comment: In 1960. And when I made so bold as to ask why we had to wait until then, I again received the same reply from each: Because that is the wish of the Blessed Virgin.' We are now in 1967. As the wishes of Heaven do not change, I believe that Sister Lucy wanted to implore the Pope, the other day, to make known to the world the warnings of Our Lady and that, perhaps, she had been charged with making this request as a sort of final appeal, an ultimatum. The cup is overflowing, iniquity has reached its fill. It is absolutely vital that the entire Church should be made aware into what abyss of sin mankind is sinking."

But why did you go to Fatima? By your pilgrimage, so it would seem, you killed it dead. No one speaks about it any more - neither about the Divine Requests which had been made known there, nor about the conversion of Russia, nor about the Secret, nor about the devotional practices recommended - and least of all, about "praying the Rosary for Peace", which Lucy had personally asked you to "intensify" on that famous 13th of May. (**)

What you did was simply this: to replace the Message of the Queen of Peace with your own. In place of the Design of God which was revealed to us at Fatima: "You must tell the whole world that God wishes to accord His graces through the Immaculate Heart of

(*) Lettres à mes Amis, No 247.

(**) La Croix (5th June 1967 - date of the outbreak of the "Seven Days' War" in the Middle East) published this information, given by Fr Almeida, the Pope's interpreter during the visit.

Mary, that men must have no hesitation in asking them of her, and that the Sacred Heart of Jesus desires to be venerated together with the Heart of His Mother; that men must pray for peace to this Immaculate Heart because God has entrusted it with this task", you have put your own Great Design - as you had revealed it at Manhattan - which consists in asking peace of the hearts of men, for it is in these you have put your trust.

Moreover, you did not hesitate to further your aims by letting it be inferred that you had been blest with a heavenly revelation. Speaking from the window of your apartments at the Vatican on the evening of your return, you said: "At Fatima We asked the Madonna what paths we are to follow in order to attain peace, and we received the reply that peace was indeed attainable." The general impression gained in Rome from these words is summed up by a reporter writing for *Messaggero*: "It would be easy to read our own meaning into such an unusual turn of phrase, but we may be allowed to think that in the course of his pilgrimage to Fatima Paul VI had a moment of what one might term inward communication with our Advocate, the Mother and Guardian of a mankind striving for peace."

And that was just the impression you wished to give: that you had been assured of the support of Heaven in your striving for the attainment of your Great Design, in your summoning of all men to build a new Peace, not by the only means recognised by our Catholic Faith - through prayer and penance - but through the new means revealed to you - Peace and Progress, or *Populorum Progressio*... You tried to make Heaven endorse your own infernal message which you have been repeating over and over again since Manhattan: that peace is possible because men are good, that peace can be attained by the joint efforts of all men, under the direction of the international Judeo-Masonic organisations. In your message the Cult of Man replaces that of God.

That is why the highlight of your visit was not a prayer to God but a strange, a scandalous Prayer to Men.

"Yes, Peace is a gift of God, and presupposes the intervention of His action which is so good, so full of mercy, and so mysterious. But it is not necessarily a miraculous gift; it is a gift which accomplishes its wonders within the secret of men's hearts; a gift which requires their free acceptance and their free cooperation. And therefore, after having addressed Our prayer to Heaven, we now address it to all men throughout the world:

Men, make yourselves worthy of the divine gift of Peace.

Men, be men.

Men, be good, be wise, be open to the interests of the general well-being of the world.

Men, be generous...

Men, begin to come closer to one another in your desire to build a new world.

Yes, a world of true men which can never come about without the sun of God shining upon its horizon..."

This is a discourse of Antichrist. You came to Fatima in order that She who is able to crush the head of the serpent should be crushed in her turn, and that her Message - wherein lies mankind's last hope of being saved - should be destroyed by another message contrary to it, in which you call upon men to build a new world upon a foundation of pride.

If I am telling lies, prove it! Prove that you are not of Satan but of Christ by publishing the Third Secret of Fatima, by calling all Christians to Prayer and Penance, by asking that the recitation of the Rosary for Peace should be intensified, and by pronouncing the Consecration of the World to the Immaculate Heart of Mary upon which depends peace - "because God has entrusted it with this task".

« RETURN, AND CONFIRM THY BRETHREN »

Most Holy Father,

I have finished my task. Had I realised in advance its full extent - the implacable logic and the various interconnections among the elements of your system, which forms the most dangerous and subtle instrument of war to have ever been introduced into the Church for her ruin - I doubt whether I should have had the courage to undertake it.

I was enabled to carry my labour to its completion thanks, no doubt, to the grace of God - for many were the prayers that went up to Him for our intention - and the encouragement to continue the work which I received daily from friends both old and new, not to speak of the enrolments into our Roman Legion, which rose from 3000 to 4000 during the fortnight in which I was writing this Libellum Accusationis (*).

However, I feel impelled to protest once more, before God and before Your Holiness, that I am only a wretched and useless servant of the Church, who is filled with confusion at finding himself in the role of prosecutor of him who is the Father of all of us - a role I assumed only because so many others more worthy and more competent than myself were unwilling to do so.

The deficiencies of this Memorandum stem from my own unworthiness, its omissions and weaknesses are due to my personal inadequacy. There would have been a hundred times as many things to say, but I had to pick and choose amongst your words and deeds, and my choice may sometimes have been inept. To compile a complete dossier would have required greater strength and fuller knowledge than I possess. A mind better versed in the theological disciplines would have pinpointed more accurately the contradictions between the things we hold against you and the teaching and Tradition of the Church. Though certain worthy and competent individuals suggested that I should do so, I did not dare to make this work into a formal Syllabus of the errors in Dogma and Morals pertaining to the post-Conciliar decade. That remains yet to be done.

Moreover, I am not satisfied with the tone and the style of what I have written: my evil nature has allowed too much of my feelings and my indignation to appear in my expressions. Yes indeed, so far as my style and my language - the vagaries of my pen - are concerned, I am certainly worthy of blame. Of this I am keenly aware.

I have to think of Oza, of whom the Book of Samuel tells us that he "put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it: because the oxen kicked and made it lean aside. And the indignation of the Lord was enkindled against Oza: and he struck him for his rashness. And he died there before the ark of God." (II Kings, 6, 6-7) Have not I, too, reason to fear, I who have laid my hand on the Ark of the Church in an effort to prevent it capsizing, and in the process of doing so have stood up against the Captain who is steering it into the abyss!

But whatever the imperfections of my work, however painfully purified I may have to be by God on their account, or whatever reproaches they may earn me from my brethren, I do not repent of having undertaken the task itself. For I am ready to be anathematised for the sake of my Brother in the Faith, Pope Paul VI - I would give my life, my all, for his betterment and conversion, for on him depend the temporal fate and the everlasting salvation of thousands of millions of human beings redeemed by the Blood of Christ, and my brothers...

No, I have no regrets. Many of those who are wise according to the world have quoted to me the phrase that enables them to justify their own inaction, their obedience to all your orders, their unconditional submission to all your ideas: "I would rather be

(*) At the time of publication of the Libellum in French, at the end of May 1973, the number was 5000.

wrong with the Pope than right against him." And indeed, I have found it painful to the point of anguish to "be right against the Pope". Is there a greater tragedy for a Catholic, a greater calvary for a priest brought up to admire Rome and venerate the Sovereign Pontiff, than to find himself - and not in mere matters of secondary importance - no longer for the Pope but against him?

But it was that other antithesis which prevailed in my mind - that between being right and being wrong. How could one consciously and deliberately choose to "be wrong" - and still less to rejoice in it - even out of loyalty to the Pope - when that would mean renouncing Truth, which is of God, in favour of Error, which is of Satan! In rejecting your innovations and denouncing them as attempts to change the divine teaching of the Church, I found myself, on the contrary, more and more firmly in the grip of Truth, and in the joy of this I forgot the pain I suffered through having to be against Your Holiness. For "to be right" is something good and holy!

Oh, what harm has been wrought among priests by these facile maxims which have less substance than appears on the surface. Used with an ironic overtone by those very rebels and innovators who are only too ready to believe themselves right against the Pope - and against the Church, and against God Himself - they serve to keep the entire Church, no longer concerned about being right or wrong, in a state of submission to a Pope who is himself a rebel and an innovator!

Most Holy Father,

Filled with the contemplation of divine Truth, I felt mysteriously sustained even while I was preparing this shattering list of your errors and acts of scandal, and imbibed a deep joy from being thus united in faith to the divine Mystery. And I feel impelled to ask you to accept this expression of my compassion and the exhortation which I make so bold as to address to you, prostrate at your feet, to have pity on Holy Mother Church and to remember to pay God the honour due to Him.

Most Holy Father, have pity on your own soul!

During these days and nights when I have, as it were, been dwelling within your own mind - making an index of your thoughts, analysing your feelings and your aims, recording your decisions - I could not but become conscious of the terrible havoc wrought within your own self by all this new and heretical teaching. I have seen you standing alone, confronting all your Predecessors and - notwithstanding the applause of the world in a semblance of unanimity - cut off from the Church herself, from all the Saints and the multitudes of faithful who peopled our great Catholic past.

I have been obliged to measure the depth, and breadth, and height, of this Great Design which within your own soul is confronting the Faith of the Church. I compared it, instinctively, with that of your Predecessor, St Pius X: "The Triumph of God over individuals, as over society as a whole, can consist of nothing else than the return of those who have gone astray, to God through Christ and to Christ through His Church: this is Our programme"(*). Yours is, on the contrary, to carry the Catholic Church into a more vast and indiscriminate New Christianity based on Faith in Man, and the Cult of Man-who-makes-himself-god, which in its turn is to make way for that Tower of Babel which is being built by the World today.

I have been filled with horror to see what deterioration has taken place within your own self, asking myself what is the evil influence which has you in its power and fearing for the eternal salvation of your soul. Yes, Most Holy Father, I who am a miserable sinner among sinners, dare to tell you that I suffer greatly on your behalf at the thought of God's Judgement - so close, so inexorable - and I must entreat you to have pity on your own soul.

When I address you thus, it is in the confidence of being heard. For have you not, on various occasions, in discourses other than those with which I have been concerned here, yourself allowed us to see the anguish you feel at your own inadequacy and unworthiness? And I cannot forget that strange admission which you made to the pilgrims at your Wednesday audience on 12th April 1967:

"We find a strange thing taking place within Ourselves: in Our desire to comfort you, We find Ourselves beginning to share, in a certain sense, the feeling of your danger, from which We would wish to protect you. And, conscious of our inadequacy, We think of the weakness of Simon, son of John, who was called upon to become Peter by the Will of Christ...Doubt...fear...the temptation to adapt one's faith to the modern mentality..

(*) Communium Rerum, 21st April 1909.

unreflecting enthusiasm..." Yes, we can often discern in your words an element of distress which cannot but incite us to redouble our prayers for Your Holiness - and to appeal to you to break free from that sinister influence which holds you bound, turn back to Our Lord Jesus Christ and "confirm thy brethren".

You spoke, on Ash Wednesday last, about the final destiny of man - "Life everlasting... or eternal damnation", and you added immediately, with reference to this second, terrifying prospect: "And this makes us shudder". Those were your words. Indeed, the very thought is enough to make all those shudder who will not do the Will of God. For it is a terrifying thought - terrifying for heretics, for schismatics, for those who commit scandal. How could I, after having noted your guilt on all three counts, refrain from adding, from the bottom of my heart: Most Holy Father, have pity on your own eternal destiny!

Most Holy Father, have pity on the Church!

The Church, entrusted to your care and for which you will one day be called upon to account, is drifting to her ruin as a result of your continuous innovation and "reformation", which is disrupting and wearing her out. You are aware of this, for you described the sad state of affairs in dramatic terms on 7th December 1968. Only you did not realise - though it was the third anniversary of your proclamation of the Cult of Man - that such disaster was the inevitable result of your own error.

"The Church finds herself in an hour of disquiet, of self-criticism, one could almost say, of auto-demolition. It is like an inward upheaval, complex and full of anguish, such as no one would have expected after the Council. (On this point you are mistaken, and are misleading your audience, for we did expect this and we were saying and writing so much to this effect that the Church authorities, acting with your approval, applied the most ignominious sanctions in order to silence us!) We had expected to see, rather, an expansion and flourishing of the ideas ripened in the great sessions of the Council. This aspect exists also, certainly, but...it is the sad aspect which is the more prominent. It is as though the Church were working for her own ruin."

By 29th June 1972 your view of what was taking place in the Church had become blacker still, and alarmed even those still ignorant of the sorry sight presented by the Church undergoing her "reformation": "Through some crack the fumes of Satan have entered the temple of God: doubt, uncertainty, questionings, dissatisfaction, confrontation, have come to the fore. We no longer trust in the Church, but in the first profane prophet who comes to speak to us from any newspaper or any gathering, to ask him if he has the formula for the true life. Doubt entered into our consciousness through that very window which ought to be open to the light..."

This state of uncertainty reigns within the Church herself. We should have expected the dawn following the Council to be a day of sunshine for the Church. But in place of the sun, we have had clouds and storms, darkness, searching, uncertainty. We preach ecumenism but in fact we are drifting farther and farther apart from each other. We are doing our best to create new chasms instead of filling them in.

But what has happened? We will confide to you Our thought: that an adverse power has intervened - the Devil - that mysterious being to whom St Peter alludes in his Epistle. And how many times does Christ not speak to us in the Gospel about this enemy of men! This supernatural(*) thing has appeared in the world precisely in order to ruin and dry up the fruits of the Ecumenical Council and to prevent the Church breaking into hymns of joy at having rediscovered her consciousness of herself."

So the Devil is the enemy of the Council? Is he not rather on the same side, and come to assert his leadership of it? In any case, the fact remains that the situation is a terrible one. So what are you going to do to save God's own Church from the clutches of Satan, the destructive reality of which you have just acknowledged?

You do, admittedly, show some desire to help, to confirm your brethren in the Faith: "We wish, therefore, today more than ever, that we were able to exercise the function which God entrusted to Peter: to confirm thy brethren in the Faith. We should like to give you that charism of certainty which God has bestowed upon him who represents him on this earth, whatever his personal unworthiness."(**) Nevertheless, in comparison with the power of Satan, and with the extent of the present ills, your halfhearted inclination to do something about it seems to us very paltry indeed!

And therefore we make so bold as to exhort you to think of the Church! Even if you

(*) The term was later changed to "preternatural"!

(**) From same Discourse as previous passage: 29th June 1972

are indifferent to your personal salvation, can you not show some concern for that of the great mass of mankind, and become a courageous ruler of your people for their own sake?

Some remarks you made on a certain occasion suggested that you would be glad to retire. Though I did not attach particular importance to these, others have been very impressed: "It is the Lord who created the Church, and not we. It is neither easy nor pleasant to have certain responsibilities. But Jesus said: thou shalt be an Apostle. Upon you I will found my Church... It would be good to be able to lay aside such a responsibility. But I do not wish to do so. And I would ask you to show at least your understanding and affection for those who have to shoulder the hierarchical functions in the Church - for those, that is, who have charge of the ministry."(*)

Yes, we understand the heavy weight of his charge - "the weight of the Keys of Peter" and "the crown of thorns" suffered by the Pope in the shape of those numerous desertions and the other sad happenings in the Church which have become the bread of bitterness for him as for us. But there comes to mind the motto of St Pius X, so noble and encouraging: "Do your duty and all will be well." Was it not you, Most Holy Father, who set the barque of Peter free to drift in the tempest? You did that not only willingly, but with a passionate joy - and now you weep about the consequences. Weep, rather, for the Church!

Even worse, in this desperate situation, you let go the rudder and leave to God alone the care of saving the Church which has been set upon this disastrous course by none but yourself. You were saying, already on 7th December 1968: "There are those who would expect of the Pope dramatic gestures, decisive and energetic interventions. The Pope considers that he has to follow no course other than that of placing his trust in Jesus Christ, who loves His Church more than anyone else. It will be He who will calm the tempest. How many times has Jesus not said: 'Have confidence in God, and believe in Me!' The Pope shall be the first to follow this commandment of the Lord and to abandon himself without disquiet and undue distress to the mysterious action of the invisible but very definite help which Jesus has assured for His Church."

This reasoning is false. Three years before, when the question had been how to reform, modify, change, and generally turn everything upside down, it was you who did it, it was you who were at the helm and made sure that it was your plans that won the day. It was you who prepared all the conditions necessary for this tempest now racking the Church. And now you think you can sit back with your arms folded, leaving go of the rudder which God had placed within your hands and which you had manipulated so effectively in order to steer us into the present disaster? You think you can leave it to Jesus to save you through a miracle?

"Heaven will help those who help themselves". Look rather to the example of Saint Paul, who led those around him to safety, promising that the lives of all should be saved, on condition that they would do all that lay within their power. (Acts, 27)

Then, on 21st June 1972, you again expressed this false view according to which you could disown all responsibility and lay it upon others - on Satan for the evil which you had done, and on Christ for leading us to that safety which we need to attain:

"In certain of Our personal notes, We find the following relevant remark: 'Perhaps the Lord has called me to this service not because I have a particular aptitude or because I should govern the Church and save it from its present difficulties, but because I should suffer something for the Church: it is clear that He, and no one else, guides and saves it.' We are now confiding this Our thought to you, not in order to make a public - and - and therefore boastful - act of humility, but so that you too may enjoy that peace of mind which We feel at the thought that it is not Our weak and inexperienced hand which is at the tiller of the barque of Peter, but the invisible, strong, and loving hand of the Lord Jesus."

Your words are hypocritical and pernicious, because the Lord never did call you to endanger the Church through your Reformation and you would not now have the problem of saving her if only you had ruled her in accordance with the just and saintly tradition of your Predecessors. But to let go the rudder now and abandon the barque to the fury of the waves is to tempt God - to call for a miracle when one's duty lies rather in humbly admitting one's mistake and - together with all others on board - doing whatever lies within one's power to save the ship. It was you, Most Holy Father, and not Christ, who desired and conducted this criminal Reformation. Therefore it should be your duty, not that of the Lord, to carry through a corresponding Catholic Counter-

(*) Osservatore Romano, 30th May 1972.

Reformation, or - if you will not or cannot do this - to give up your place to another. But on no account should you continue to fill a place of honour if you refuse to carry out the duties that go with it, nor to go on expecting from your people an obedience and a trust of which you are not worthy.

Most Holy Father, think of the honour due to God!

TO OUR FATHER IN HEAVEN - whose reflection - we might almost say - whose lieutenant on earth you are, entrusted in place of His well-beloved Son with teaching, grazing, ruling His flock... To God, who has bestowed on you the light and energy of His Holy Spirit, making you the Head of that Mystical Body of which He is the Soul... to God who has overwhelmed you with His graces because you are His chosen instrument for the sanctification of mankind...

You are the living link in that immortal chain of the succession of Roman Pontiffs without which we should lack all that is worth having. As you are in that position, we plead with you to think of the glory of our Heavenly Father and give up struggling against the things which appertain to His design, which is worth thousands and thousands of times more than your silly daydreams!

HALLOWED BE HIS NAME - may it be glorified through your ministry! Cease, then, to offer your praise and glory to Man - to Man who seeks to make himself God - and to flatter him in the things created through his pride, the insignificance of which you must surely realise from your lofty vantage point. Think of the thousands of millions of human beings who still await, helpless in the darkness and the shadows of death, the revelation of the Divine Name. Try to feel joy at the thought of God's Great Design to bring all men to the knowledge of His Holiness and Glory. Oh what a wonderful vision of our Faith to see the whole of mankind from pole to pole joining as one man in the first petition of the Pater Noster: Sanctificetur Nomen tuum.

We implore you to cease to preach us the cult of Man and exhort us instead to hallow the Name of Our Father in Heaven!

MAY HIS KINGDOM COME - helped by your indefatigable zeal. For what are the United Nations, UNESCO, and the rest of these international organisations compared with His Kingdom, with His Church, "the only international body which has lasted", in the words of Charles Maurras, that political thinker whom you do not care for but who spoke well when he said that. You flog yourself building sand castles when the same energy put into the ordered and peaceful service of the Church would have brought her great increase in numbers and influence, today, when men's expectations, as well as their misery, are so great. What can a Roman like yourself find so fascinating about Manhattan? For is not Rome herself the City of cities, the source from which radiates both divine grace and human civilisation? How is it that you have so much more admiration for the pagan crowds in Bombay than for the Catholics in Portugal singing the unforgettable Fatima Hymn: Ave, Ave, Ave Maria? Is not Our Lady, Virgin and Mother, and Queen of Christendom, the instrument through which men can attain holiness?

Oh, how I pray that your eyes may at long last be opened to the vision of the glory of the Church through the ages and that, forgetting your aversion to it, throwing aside your pre-prepared discourses, you may be led to exclaim: "How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, and thy tents, O Israel!" (Numb. 24,5) May that "happy vision of peace" - of mankind united from East to West, in accordance with the prophecies of Isaiah, in the One True Church, inspire you with the courage needed to undertake the heroic task of preparing the new Counter-Reformation. If you could but drop your fanciful Utopias in which God has no place, and devote yourself instead to that Church which is in existence here and now - Christ's Church and yours - and pray: Adveniat Regnum tuum.

HIS WILL BE DONE, ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN. For the past ten years it is men's will that has been done, encouraged by your own Declaration of Religious Liberty, and the results are there for all to see. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity - the Great Principles of 1789 - have replaced the Laws of God, and you can see what sort of place the earth has become as a result. The price paid to make the Charter of the Rights of Man into the law of the world has been far too high in terms of pain and sweat, tears and bloodshed. Cease then to extol the Law of Satan and return in all humility to the faithful observance of the Commandments of God and of the Church.

God, who is slow in anger and rich in mercy, will speedily drive back into the depths of Siberia and Mongolia the Communist hordes who are to form the blind instruments of His wrath. And, in response to your prayers, He will once again dispense His abundant grace to the peoples, so that they will turn away from the false humanism which prevails today and from the idolatrous cult which mankind renders to itself. God

will forgive and God will help, provided that Rome returns to the observance of her Laws, both of the Natural Law and the Revealed Law of Moses and the Gospels. We pray you to assume the role of the Legislator and Judge who rejoices in upholding the Honour of God and takes every care to defend His Rights and make His Will prevail throughout the earth. To those who seek the Kingdom of God and His Justice, the rest will be added.

Return again to Fatima, Most Holy Father, and there, joining your voice to that of the vast crowd praying as one, say with them: Fiat Voluntas tua sicut in coelo et in terra. And when you decide to yield to Mary's requests, you will be granted the miraculous gift of Peace!

At any rate, and regardless of what we do, the future belongs to God, Our Father. And the future belongs to Jesus Christ, Son of God and our Saviour, and not to any other king or messias or lord of this world. For already, "the prince of this world" has been "cast out". (John, 12, 31) The future belongs to God's own Church, which is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. No MASDU of Satan shall prevail against her.

For my part, I feel happy and confident in spite of my personal insignificance, at having completed this task which needed to be done. I have said before, and repeat now: may God punish me if I am wrong and have deceived those who follow me: may He strike me with violent death if I have served falsehood and not truth. There are certain exceptional moments in the course of history when the fog lies so heavy that - in the absence of infallible human judges - he who has enough faith is compelled to make a direct appeal to God's judgement, as in past days, through an ordeal.

But for your part, Most Holy Father, now that you have been handed(*) this booklet containing the charges against you, you have forfeited your rightful place in the Church - and in relation to Christ Himself - until such time as you make use of your Infallibility to declare where the truth lies and where the error, in this state of division and scandal which is ravaging the Church. It gives me pain to be the bearer of this summons calling upon you to do your duty, but it is a divine as well as a human summons. It is charity that has guided me and given me the necessary courage. For unless and until you make up your mind to undo the heresy, the schism and the scandal of these past ten years - or even fifty in your personal case - of which you have now been publicly accused before your own Tribunal, you will have no rest, either in this world or in the next.

We ask you, finally, Most Holy Father, to grant us, as a sign of the bond of Catholic charity, that we may recite, together with you, three Pater Nosters and three Aves for your intentions, for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff as these have always been defined and as I find them in the Manual of Prayer of Ars published in 1844: "Let us pray for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff: for the propagation of the Faith, for the exaltation of Holy Mother Church, for the destruction of heresies and for peace between Christian Princes." For these are really and truly our intentions and surely they must also be yours!

Pater Noster...

Ave Maria...

We entreat Your Holiness, in accordance with the just and lawful power of your Sovereign Priesthood, to pray that the light and grace of God may descend upon us, and to bless the devoted members of the League of the Catholic Counter-Reformation - including the least worthy among them,

Your Holiness's humble servant and son,

Georges de Nantes

Completed on the days of the twenty-fifth anniversary of my ordination and my first Holy Mass, the 27th and 28th March 1973, at Maison Saint-Joseph, Saint Parres lès Vaudes, France.

(*) Pope Paul VI did not in fact accept the booklet and rigorous precautions were taken to prevent it being handed to him. See CRC No 67, CCR No 38.

CONTENTS

	Page
Address to the Holy Father	1
Introduction	3
The Capital Charge	7
Heresy	14
Schism	34
Scandal	49
"Return and Confirm thy Brethren"	69